

In the September Farm Bureau township meetings, the wheelhorses appoint themselves delegates to the annual Farm Bureau County organization meeting. These official delegates have received ideas for resolutions from their national and state officers speeches and messages. These resolutions are discussed and adopted and delegates are appointed to the district official meeting. These resolutions are all non-controversial and trivial and carefully screened by the resolution committee. All delegates and resolutions are in complete agreement with the official Farm Bureau Policy. The state and national officers receive back the resolutions they suggested and wanted and loudly proclaim that the grass roots has spoken.

The National Consumers Council is the lobbying and publicity organizations for the large food processors and chain stores. They have elected Mr. Schuman to be their presi-

dent and official spokesman. As such he is hired by the farmers' enemies to work against the farmers' interests. He and his associates are a fifth column working against the farmers' interests.

In my opinion, the enemies of the farmers are: the grain trade, the milk trust, the meat packers, the soybean processors, the chain stores, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the National Manufacturers Association.

These enemies of the farmers make their profits from low farm prices and a high volume of production. Their highly organized bargaining strength is stronger than the forces of supply and demand. So they plunder the farmer ruthlessly and disastrously. Pres. Schuman cannot see the activities of these enemies of the farmers. He very glibly blames Pres. Johnson for the farmers' low prices. President Johnson is a liberal and these

farmers' enemies are determined conservatives.

The labor union leaders have always supported the agricultural programs. They fear that a agricultural depression will ultimately cause a national depression with widespread unemployment and bankruptcy.

The Farm Bureau is very rich. It owns many business interests: local and terminal elevators, feed mills, petroleum and fertilizer plants. It owns a large insurance company, which owns stock in chain stores, railroads, and many manufacturing plants and finance companies.

The present Farm Bureau leaders have drifted far from their membership and their purpose. The present rejection by the farmers of the Farm Bureau is well deserved. The Farm Bureau needs to make a complete change in their personnel and policies.

## SENATE—Tuesday, February 27, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord and Master of us all, O Thou who dost speak to us in the quietness, with minds burdened for the Nation and for the world, we turn to Thee in this baffling hour, praying that in this fear-haunted earth, the flame of our faith may not grow dim. Unworthy though we are, Thou hast made us keepers for our day of the holy torch of freedom the Founding Fathers kindled with their lives.

We would share that sacred fire until tyranny everywhere is consumed and thus all the nations of the earth be blessed.

By a vision of Thy eternal kingdom, whose sun never sets, give us the inner strength to serve the present age. By Thine enabling grace may the ruling passions and the deepest desires of those who here are called to serve the entire Nation be worthy for the facing of this hour.

Spirit of purity and grace,  
Our weakness pitying see,  
O make our hearts thy dwelling place,  
And worthier Thee.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 26, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

#### AGRICULTURE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 267)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message

from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

The farm was here before the factory. It was the promise of productive land that pushed our people westward, and America was built on a foundation of farms and ranches supplying the food and fiber for a bountiful and restless Nation.

It was the farmer's qualities—his hard work and perseverance, his independence and initiative—which gave strength to a Nation's character.

Agriculture, our first industry, remains our greatest. It is the vital center of our economy—fueling our industry and commerce, feeding our people and the hungry of the world.

—Almost 18 million Americans work at growing our crops, processing them and shipping them to market, and supplying our farmers.

—Americans spend \$125 billion yearly for the products of our agriculture—which brings the family the most nourishing food in the world, at a modest share of its income.

—The harvest of one out of every four acres moves into foreign markets. Last year American farm exports set a new record—\$6.8 billion.

—Millions of people in other lands live today because of food grown and shipped from American farms.

—Agricultural technology, combined with modern machinery, seeds, and fertilizers, has revolutionized production. Each farmer today grows enough food for 40 persons, compared to only 10 thirty years ago.

But the American farmer, who helped to build America's prosperity, still does not fully—or fairly—share in it.

While retail food prices have risen in recent years, the prices the farmer receives have actually declined 9 percent in the past two decades.

Too many rural communities have been by-passed in the climb to abundance, the poverty of its people standing in stark contrast to the wealth of the land.

#### THE RECORD TO DATE

Farm-led and farm-fed, the depression of the 1930's plunged American agri-

culture into its darkest hour. The plight of the farmer was intolerable—five cent cotton and 20 cent corn, failure and foreclosure.

Out of those grim days, as the Nation regained strength, the basic principles of a national farm policy evolved, guiding the farmer's recovery. Through conservation and credit, price stabilization and research, a partnership with government grew. It was a new concept, but it rested on an honored American tradition—that the Nation's strength lies in independent, land-owning farmers and ranchers.

When Franklin Roosevelt signed the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938—30 years ago this month—he could tell America: "By experience we have learned what must be done to assure agriculture a fair share of an increasing national income, to provide consumers with abundant supplies of food and fiber, to stop waste of soil, and to reduce the gap between huge surpluses and disastrous shortages."

The farmer rose to the challenge of the time as he fed and clothed America's victorious armies of World War II—and, in its aftermath, fed a war-ravaged world.

But in the middle fifties the farmer fell victim to his own progress and to government indifference. Production increased while Federal programs faltered. As a result:

—Farm income from 1952 to 1960 dropped by almost 20%. Farmers netted \$2¼ billion less per year than in 1952.

—Farm surpluses swelled. By 1960, the Commodity Credit Corporation had accumulated over \$8 billion in stocks.

—Exports, a major source of farm income, failed to keep pace with rising production.

While farm programs cost the taxpayer more, farmers received less and less.

These were bitter disappointments—and from them we learned much. They led to the constructive programs of the sixties which have already shown these signs of progress:

—Today, net income per farm is 55% higher than at the beginning of the decade.

- 1966 set an all time record for gross farm income and net income per farm.
- 1967 produced the second highest per farm income in two decades, even after a disappointing price drop.
- Exports soared to a record \$6.8 billion last year, up 51% from 1960.
- Price-depressing surpluses in most commodities have been eliminated. Commodity Credit Corporation investments are down \$4.5 billion from 1960. Inventories are below \$1 billion for the first time since 1953.

#### THE PROBLEM TODAY

But as significant as these achievements are, their importance to the farmer is diminished by the realities he faces:

- His income lags. It is less than two-thirds the per capita income of the city dweller.
- His production costs are rising, and he is trapped in a vicious price-cost squeeze.
- For most commodities, he has no practical means of tailoring his output to total demand. Now he grows his crop or raises his livestock—and hopes for a good market. If that market does not come, he will not receive a fair price for the fruits of his toil.

#### WHAT IS REQUIRED

Much will be required to assure the farmer his fair and full share of America's abundance.

First, we must reinforce the partnership between the farmer and his Government.

Like any sound businessman, the agricultural producer seeks a fair return for his efforts and his risks. Yet, because of the individual nature of his operation he does not have the means to assure this return. It is here that he needs the helping hand of his Government.

That partnership works to the benefit of all. For the prosperity of the farmer is of concern to all—from the factory worker who makes the tools and machines the farmer buys, to the family who buys the food and fiber the farmer grows, and to the whole economy which is strengthened by a steady flow of farm income.

Second, we must seek out new ways to solve an old problem—overproduction, the consequence of the American farmer's enormous capacity to produce far more food than we are able to consume. For more than thirty years we have tried to balance supply and demand, to shatter the income-depressing cycle of glut and scarcity.

We have not yet succeeded in reaching that difficult goal—but in recent years we have made great strides. The foundation for progress is now in place with the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. That Act gives us the machinery to tailor production to demand, to produce the right kind of food—at the right time—in the right amounts.

We are learning to operate that new machinery more skillfully now in cooperation with farmers and their organizations.

Still, more is needed to reach the farmer's just goal of parity of income—a fair

return for his labor, management and investment.

I believe 1968 can be the year in which we move closer than ever before to that elusive goal. It can be a year of decision for the American farmer.

*I propose a 7-point plan to bring new prosperity to rural America.*

1. Permanent extension of the farmer's basic charter—the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

2. Continuation of the Food for Freedom Program through 1971.

3. Creation of a National Food Bank—a security reserve of wheat, feed grains and soybeans to protect the consumer against food scarcity and the farmer against falling prices.

4. New bargaining authority for the farmer, to give him a stronger voice in setting terms and conditions for the sale of his products.

5. Stronger regulatory programs to guard the farmer against fraud in the market place.

6. Aid and hope for the small farmer.

7. Continued revitalization of America's rural heartland by improving men's lives through decent housing, better jobs, and more rapid community development.

Taken together, these measures can hasten the day when the men and women who grow our food can share more fully in the abundance they help to create.

#### THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 is the backbone of our support for the farmer.

—For the first time, it recognized that stabilizing the market supply of our basic commodities—wheat, feed grains, and cotton—is a continuing, not a temporary, problem.

—It established price supports at near-world levels for these major commodities—with payments to stabilize incomes and acreage allotment programs to prevent surpluses from piling up.

—It provided the flexibility to adjust the farmer's production to meet domestic needs, export demand and projected shipments under the Food for Freedom Program.

Two years after its passage, the Act faced a severe test. Larger wheat and feed grain allotments for 1967 crops set under the Act were followed by a series of unforeseen events: world-wide bumper crops, smaller total demand—and lower prices for the farmer. These are the uncertainties to which every estimate—involving millions of acres, millions of tons of food and the variability of weather—is subject.

Those events of 1967 once more spurred the old cry: "get the government out of agriculture."

But the 1965 Act did not fail the farmer.

Direct payments under the Act provided the margin between profit and loss for many producers: an additional 48 cents for each bushel of wheat, 15 cents for each pound of cotton, 20 cents for each bushel of corn.

To terminate the 1965 Act would bring catastrophe and ruin to many farmers.

Cash prices to the farmer would fall—and there would be no government pay-

ments to cushion the impact. Farm income could drop by as much as one-third—back to 1959 levels.

—Wheat prices would drop to about \$1.10 a bushel—compared with the 1967 blend price of \$1.89, including the wheat certificate.

—Corn prices would drop to about 75 cents a bushel, compared with a blend price of \$1.30 in 1967.

—Cotton would sell for 18 cents a pound, compared with 42 cents in 1967 with price support payments.

—With lower grain prices, livestock supplies would soon overburden the market so that livestock prices would decline by at least 10%.

Certainly the Act can be improved. Suggestions to strengthen it should be carefully reviewed. But it must be continued.

*This should be permanent legislative authority.* The need for price protection will not end in one—or two—or even the four years provided in the 1965 Act.

While the Congress may choose to modify these programs in future years, the farmer should not run the risk of sudden termination of this vital protection. Only permanent authority will assure that he is never the innocent victim of a program lapse.

*Although the Act does not expire until 1969, it should be extended this year.* Before this Congress adjourns, the 1969 wheat program must be announced. And before Congress meets in 1969, final year programs for all the other commodities under the current Act must be announced.

The agricultural producer, like all prudent businessmen, should be in a position to make his plans well in advance.

To postpone consideration of this vital legislation until next year would create grave risks for the American farmer.

*I recommend that the Congress begin hearings at the earliest possible date to extend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.*

#### FOOD FOR FREEDOM

The clock continues to tick in the developing nations—as the shadow of hunger threatens to turn into a nightmare of famine.

That awesome problem has long summoned America's attention. Since World War II, we have helped meet world food needs with contributions from the storehouse of our agricultural abundance.

In 1966, I proposed that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger. At that time, I asked the Congress to join in a new and concerted food aid program—Food for Freedom. Two years of achievement show that the program was wise as well as compassionate:

—The bounty from America's farmlands and granaries has rescued millions of people from the brink of starvation.

—Developing nations are helping themselves through national policies centering on agricultural development.

—Sales are now shifting from foreign currencies to dollars. This repayment trend will improve our own balance of payments.

—Food shipments are creating future overseas markets for the products of



our farms and our industry, as the economies of developing nations grow stronger.

This lifeline of hope to the needy of the world cannot be withdrawn. The Food for Freedom Program expires at the end of this year.

*I recommend that the Congress continue the Food for Freedom Program for three more years—to December 31, 1971.*

As before, our efforts must be rooted in self-help. Aid that does not encourage the maximum effort of each nation to feed its own people is illusory—and a deception to those who receive it.

Our efforts must also continue to be grounded in world cooperation, because hunger is a world problem which must be met by many nations.

The Kennedy Round turned that principle to action as other nations joined the United States in the International Grains Agreement.

I recently asked the Senate to approve that Agreement. It calls for a three-year program of food aid. Participating nations have agreed to supply 4.5 million tons of grain annually. The U.S. share—1.9 million tons—will be met as part of the Food for Freedom Program.

The Grains Agreement is good news for the American farmer. It provides new insurance against falling wheat prices. And it builds new cash customers for his products.

*I again urge the Senate to ratify the International Grains Agreement at the earliest possible time.*

#### SECURITY COMMODITY RESERVE—A NATIONAL FOOD BANK

When the talk is of farm surpluses, the term "food scarcity" has an unrealistic ring. Yet even America is not completely immune from a natural disaster or some other emergency that could imperil our food supply.

America's food stocks are also affected by another factor—our humane response to the hardship and hunger that may strike other nations.

In the light of these contingencies, we must develop a national food strategy to assure that:

- Production is sufficient to meet domestic needs.
- Additional production is scaled to meet requirements for exports and food aid shipments.
- A security reserve is on hand to protect against unforeseen emergencies or variations between production estimates and actual need.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 and the Food for Freedom Program provide a solid basis for this national strategy. Acreage allotments established under the 1965 Act are based on anticipated domestic consumption and foreign demand. Food for Freedom shipments furnished an important part of that total demand.

But, as we have learned, no system of estimates can be precise. Searing winds, drought and flood can deplete production quickly and cause scarcity. And as we have also learned, surplus stocks—even when temporary—can depress the farmer's income.

What America needs is a National Food Bank—where deposits can be made

in time of plenty, and withdrawals in time of shortage.

Last year, legislation was introduced to create such a Bank—a Security Reserve of wheat, feed grains, and soybeans. Hearings have been held in both Houses.

*I urge the Congress to complete consideration of this important legislation at the earliest possible date.* This Administration will continue its strong support of a measure which includes these principles:

- The establishment of a reserve owned by farmers through strengthened resale provisions in the price support program. The farmer would control sales from a part of this reserve, but some of these stocks would be held under long-term arrangements for emergency use.
- Authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase an additional reserve at market prices. It should not be necessary for prices to drop to the support levels to add to the reserve stocks held by the government.
- Insulation of this food bank from the commercial market. The Secretary of Agriculture should not sell reserve stocks at less than parity adjusted for government payments.

A National Food Bank can provide important protection for all Americans.

- The farmer will not have to bear the burden of depressed prices when production exceeds current needs.
- The consumer will be protected from unanticipated food scarcity.
- The government will have a reserve stock "cushion" in making acreage allotment decisions, and in responding to international emergencies.

#### FARMER BARGAINING POWER

Government programs for wheat, feed grains, cotton, or other basic commodities strengthen the bargaining power of participating farmers. Under the loan program with its recently expanded resale privileges, the farmer can hold his crop for a better market.

But items which provide 60 percent of gross farm income—including livestock, poultry, fruits and vegetables—are not covered by Government price support and payment programs.

The producer sells these commodities for what the market will bear.

This is fair enough—if the farmer has the power to bargain effectively with those to whom he sells. But he does not.

—There are millions of farmers and their power is diffused and fragmented. In contrast, the distributors and processors who buy the farmer's products are relatively few and well organized.

—Farmers do not have the means to tailor carefully their production to market demands. If they produce too much, they have little hope for a decent price at market time.

—Most businessmen can set a price for their goods. Most farmers must sell their products for "what they can get."

In some ways, government action helps the farmer to bargain for better terms in the market place. Government purchases under Section 32, Food Stamp, School Lunch, Milk, and commodity dis-

tribution programs create additional demand—and even out over supplies which could depress prices.

Still, the Government is—and can be—a customer for only a fraction of the total market.

*The fact remains that the farmer does not have the bargaining power he needs—he still does not have the ability to price his products for a fair profit.*

Some farmers—in cooperatives and marketing associations—have found that their collective voice is far stronger than individual efforts. They have utilized marketing orders and marketing contracts to achieve higher prices and better terms of sale.

They are the pioneers.

Now thousands of other farmers are beginning to think about farmer bargaining.

They seek an end to the frustration caused by their lack of bargaining power.

They see the opportunities for lower costs and better prices through market organization and coordination of supply.

They know the value of transforming haphazard farm production into steady flows of products of uniform quality—fitted to the needs of our modern food industry.

Several months ago, I directed the Secretary of Agriculture to study the various bargaining and marketing tools available to agricultural producers.

I asked agricultural economists and other experts from outside the government to participate in this effort. The farm organizations have taken leading roles in advancing bargaining techniques.

It is now time for the Congress to join this effort.

*I urge the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture to hold hearings this session on the various means of strengthening farmer bargaining power in the market place.*

Among the issues the hearings should consider are these:

- Will bargaining efforts be equally effective for all commodities?
- What kind of bargaining unit should farmers establish?
- For what should farmers bargain? Better price? Uniform quality? Other terms of sale?
- Should the bargaining unit be able to limit marketing or production to meet bargaining objectives? If so, how should these limitations be administered or enforced?

One matter is clear. The government may act as an advisor, or it may serve as an umpire. But the plan must be designed for farmers to use if they choose. It cannot be forced upon them. Under any proposal, farmers must make their own decisions and control their own destinies.

*Upon completion of these studies and the Congressional hearings, we will make specific recommendations for action.*

#### FRAUDULENT PRACTICES

Fraudulent and deceptive practices sap the vitality of our economy. In the case of the farmer, they impose special hazards and handicaps. Wherever these practices are found, they must be rooted out.

Last week, I was proud to sign a measure guarding against fraud and manipulation in the Nation's commodity exchanges.

But there is still unfinished farmer protection business before Congress.

*I urge the Congress to modernize the Packers and Stockyards Act.*

This Act is intended to safeguard livestock and poultry producers against cases of deceit, fraud and unfair competition. The present law has failed to keep pace with developments in the livestock and poultry industries since the Act was first adopted almost half a century ago.

#### LIFE IN RURAL AMERICA

The proposals I have discussed to this point are designed to place American commercial agriculture on a sounder and stronger footing.

But this is only half the battle.

For there are thousands of men and women in rural America who need a different kind of help.

The statistics tell the grim story:

- Farm employment has fallen by 46% between 1950 and 1967.
- Nearly 1.5 million small farmers earn less than \$5,000 per year. Their resources are meager and they have little to sell. Their existence may hang on a thin thread: a few acres of tobacco and cotton, an old-age pension, and the Food Stamp Program.
- The rate of unemployment and underemployment in rural America far exceeds the national average.
- 10 million people in rural America—one in every five falls under the poverty line, and millions of families live in housing that shames a modern nation.

What promise is there for the sharecropper who has been replaced by a machine? What new job will open up to the 50-year-old farmer who has spent his entire life working the soil? What future can a young farm boy aspire to, when only one out of ten can expect to earn a living as a full-time farmer?

Unprepared and untrained—with nowhere else to go—they have left the land they know and streamed into the teeming slums of American cities.

The problem they pose touches us all. It is a problem of urban America no less than rural America.

We have long spoken of parity of opportunity for rural Americans. I speak now of making that promise a reality.

It will require action—both long and short range. The foundation of that effort has been built.

- The war on poverty is quietly transforming the lives of thousands of men and women in rural America.
- "Operation Outreach," launched last year, brings 90 Federal programs, from health to housing, from education to economic development, to the countryside. Under the coordination of the Secretary of Agriculture, Technical Action Panels organized at the regional, state, district and county level are assuring that these programs turn into effective action for the people.

#### FOOD STAMPS

But some people still go hungry in rural America.

The Food Stamp Program has been an effective instrument to supplement the purchasing power of low-income families. When I signed the Food Stamp Act of 1964, the program was being tested in 43 areas. Today, it is operating in over 850 counties. By early summer, it will extend to 1200, providing the basic essential of life to over two million needy men, women and children.

*I recommend that the 1969 appropriation authorization for the Food Stamp Program be increased from \$225 million to \$245 million.*

#### THE SMALL FARMER

Many of our poorest farmers cannot leave the farm for other work. They are untrained. And they have passed the age when job opportunities can open up a new life. They are boxed in.

They cannot "go into something else," for there is no place else to go. But they can be aided more effectively—and economically—on the farm.

*I have directed the Secretary of Agriculture to focus the full range of the programs under his jurisdiction to help the small farmer.*

*I am also proposing legislation that will:*

- Increase funds available to small farmers to begin new farm and non-farm enterprises; and to provide credit to help the farmer to convert his land into income producing recreation areas.
- Improve the loan program for grazing associations.
- Establish a credit program for rural cooperatives now ineligible for assistance from the Banks for Cooperatives or the poverty program.

I am also asking the Congress to appropriate additional funds to help low-income ranchers, who depend on National Forest lands for much of their livestock grazing, and to increase technical assistance to cooperatives owned by small farmers.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Thirty years ago, the lights went on across the farmlands of America. Rural electrification liberated the farmer and his family from the tyranny of darkness. Lights, appliances, radios—all the conveniences of modern living—replaced the kerosene lamp and the flickering candle. Electricity eased the farmer's burden, and brought industry and jobs to rural America.

Rural electrification is a great American success story.

We must advance that success and bring it up to date by assuring the growth of the nation's rural electrification systems in the areas they have been called upon to serve. Those systems must have access, under fair and reasonable rates, to bulk power supplies. In this way, they can continue to provide a reliable, uninterrupted, and inexpensive flow of electricity into America's farm communities on a par with more populous communities.

#### RURAL HOUSING

There are places in the hollows and small country towns that look as if America had never moved forward from the grim days of depression.

Over three million families outside our

metropolitan areas live in ramshackle and dilapidated dwellings.

More than half of the Nation's 6 million substandard housing units are outside our metropolitan areas.

But our federal housing programs have not been able to reach effectively enough into those dusty roads of a by-passed America.

I propose that we move now to correct this situation.

First, I have already recommended legislation to launch a new program, in cooperation with industry and labor, to add 6 million new housing units over the next 10 years for families with low and moderate incomes.

*I am directing the Secretary of Agriculture to work with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in bringing this new program to our rural areas.*

Much of the necessary assistance can be rendered by the Farmers Home Administration. For more than three decades, it has helped provide home financing for rural citizens.

I want to make certain that the residents of rural America participate fully in this important housing program.

*Second, I have recommended legislation which will:*

- Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the interest rates for low and moderate income families so they can borrow under existing rural housing loan programs.
- Broaden the eligibility for credit under the rural housing loan program.
- Make low-income non-rural residents who have jobs in rural areas eligible for housing loans.

*Third, I have directed the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to insure that the rent supplement program has maximum impact in rural as well as urban areas.*

#### JOBS AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The rural American displaced by technology has a proud heritage of hard work. He does not want welfare. He wants a job.

If the jobs are in the cities, men will move there.

Eighteen months ago, in Dallastown, Pennsylvania, I said:

History records a long, hard struggle to establish man's right to go where he pleases and to live where he chooses . . . We lose that freedom when our children are obliged to live someplace else if they want a job or if they want a decent education. Not just sentiment demands that we do more to help our farms and rural communities. I think the welfare of this Nation demands it. And . . . I think the future of the cities of America demands it, too.

Today 70 percent of our people live on 1 percent of our land. By the turn of the century—if present trends continue—there will be 240 million Americans living in urban areas occupying only 4 percent of this great and spacious nation.

I think we can change this trend by setting a goal of full parity of opportunity for Rural America. Industry, technology and transportation can bring jobs to the countryside rather than people to the cities. And government must help.

In our growing economy, private en-



terprise—today—is creating thousands of new jobs in the small towns of America. We can do more to develop job opportunities and to provide assistance to those who want work.

With legislation now on the books, we can move to reduce rural underemployment and unemployment by the end of 1968. I have directed:

- The Secretaries of Commerce and Agriculture to develop an expanded credit program for firms seeking to locate new plants in rural areas.
- The Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to give top priority to loans for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas.
- The Secretary of Labor to extend work training and job counseling programs. With the Census Bureau, he will undertake regular surveys of labor market conditions in rural areas.
- The Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to coordinate expanded area-wide manpower planning, and concerted education and training services.
- The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to help finance the creation of additional community centers where the rural resident can have access to all the programs designed to help him and his family.
- The Secretary of Labor to extend the Concentrated Employment Program, which brings together a wide range of manpower and related services in selected geographical areas, to an additional 70 areas—35 of them rural.

In addition, I have recommended legislation which would provide training facilities—and temporary housing during training—to enable low-income rural residents prepare for improved employment opportunities.

But jobs alone are not enough to make the countryside more livable and more convenient for rural Americans. What is needed is a restoration of rural-urban balance—a balance that assures rural America its full, fair share of educational, economic, social and cultural opportunity.

To help accomplish this, I recommend that the Congress:

- Increase Federal programs to assist rural communities in building modern water and sewer systems.
- Extend the period of eligibility for grants for comprehensive water and sewer projects.
- Authorize recreation projects in Resource Conservation and Development areas.
- Appropriate funds for ten new multi-county, multi-purpose Resource Conservation and Development areas during Fiscal 1969. This will give the Nation fifty-one such areas, encompassing 100 million acres.

In addition, I urge the Congress to

take action on two important measures pending before it:

- To finance comprehensive planning for groups of rural counties. Such planning can help rural communities attract business and industry and make better use of Federal programs. It can help neighboring communities pool their resources—health, education, training—to meet the common needs of their people.
- To provide additional sources of financing for rural telephone systems. We must continue to build and upgrade our telephone systems to speed economic development and community growth.

#### THE SPECIAL NEED

Our earliest destiny was shaped by those who, in Jefferson's words, "labor in the earth."

The hand that worked the plow—that led the team—that husked the corn—was the hand that guided America to its greatness.

The stability and endurance of the farmer are a priceless part of our nation's heritage. His love of the land expresses the American dream—that a man should be able to shape his own destiny with his own hands.

The American farmer today stands in the proud tradition of generations of his fathers.

But he is faced, as no generation before him, with the problems of an accelerating technology. It is bringing fundamental and forceful change to the farmer and the rural community.

The farmer and the rural community need government's help, and government must respond.

Since I have been President, I have been proud to sign 184 measures designed to assist farmers and the rural community. Each of these has filled a special need.

The proposals I have outlined in this message continue that vital work.

This is a total program—one for the years ahead as well as for today—through which the American farmer can claim his place and privilege in the life of his Nation.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 27, 1968.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 225)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting the budget of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1968.

The budget proposes fiscal 1969 appropriations of \$609 million. Revenues from existing sources will total \$371.6 million. New taxes will raise an additional \$18.9 million. The proposed Federal payment is \$83.5 million. The remainder of the budget—\$135.8 million—represents Federal loans for public facilities and com-

mitments required today for construction costs in subsequent years.

This budget requests the minimum funds necessary to meet the needs of the citizens of the Capital of the United States.

Preparation of the budget was begun by the outgoing three-commissioner government. Mayor Walter Washington and his Deputy have reviewed it intensively, and made modifications in the relatively brief time available for this purpose. This budget has been considered and amended by the District Council after public hearings. Most significantly, for the first time in nearly 100 years, the citizens of the District have had the opportunity to voice their views on budgetary proposals before a city council.

Through careful and thoughtful development of this budget, the reorganized District Government has shown that it can conduct the public's business efficiently and judiciously with active public participation. This augurs well for prompt achievement of the city's goal of self-government.

The District budget for 1969 requests funds to combat the urgent and complex problems being experienced by all the major cities of our Nation. These problems include an increase in the crime rate, growing public health needs, traffic congestion, educational demands, housing shortages, expanding welfare requirements, spiraling demands for job training and employment assistance, and air and water pollution. To attack these problems, the budget calls for funds to:

- Strengthen the police, courts, and corrections systems, including an increase in police manpower and modernization of police communications and data processing equipment.
- Improve the public school system and higher education in the District of Columbia, including improved incentives to attract and retain first-rate teachers, school construction and modernization and establishment of two new public colleges.
- Improve public health and human relations services, including the new community health center program.
- Establish a comprehensive neighborhood service center by bringing a wide range of health, recreation, and other social services together for residents in their own neighborhood.
- Build recreation centers and provide for the vital Summer Enrichment Program.
- Begin construction of the rapid rail transport system and continue construction of interstate highways.
- Expand programs to combat air and water pollution and step up the District's rat control efforts.

These improvements represent the first installment of the new District Government's promissory note to its citizens. Their needs and their expectations are great. Their budget—set forth in the transmittal letter of the Mayor—is sound and realistic and requests urgently needed funds. I recommend that the Congress approve the District budget and revenue measures for fiscal 1969.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

FEBRUARY 27, 1968.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of James E. Atwood, of Davenport, Wash., to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Daniel T. Donovan, resigned; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia submitting the nomination of Alfred P. Love for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 15131) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message informed the Senate that pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Speaker appoints as a member of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College: Mr. ZWACH, of Minnesota, to fill the existing vacancy thereon, vice Mr. NELSEN, of Minnesota, excused.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 15131) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salaries, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## IF MORE TROOPS ARE NEEDED, SEND THEM FROM EUROPE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the American people are beginning to realize there has been considerable unproven theory in the conduct of this undeclared

but large war that is now going on in Vietnam.

Over 1½ million men are presently engaged in the hostilities which can spread any day, in major fashion, to those three countries where it is already being waged in minor fashion—Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand.

This Government, in all sincerity, felt the Tonkin Gulf incident justified moving hundreds of thousands of our troops into South Vietnam to defend the so-called free nations against Communist aggression; but now finds it may well have run into the strongest force in the world today—nationalism.

In its present effort, the Government decided not to emphasize the qualitative aspects of airpower and seapower, in favor of a quantitative concept recommended by ground troop advocates; and at the same time decided on this "sanctuary" concept with respect to all three countries that border South Vietnam.

As a result, we now find ourselves bogged down in what for over half a century we have attempted to avoid—a major conflict on the land mass of Asia.

Because the Government now also finds that the over 500,000 troops currently in the Vietnam theater are not sufficient, apparently it plans to call up additional American youth for service in that theater.

If this defense of the free world against aggression is sound, in addition to defending our own country 10,000 miles from home, we are also defending Japan, the Philippines, and scores of other countries, especially those prosperous nations of Europe which the United States has worked so hard for over 20 years to place in that position.

And what are these latter countries contributing to support our effort? The answer—not a single combat soldier in Vietnam from any of them, despite the fact that these same nations have grown steadily more prosperous under the umbrella of our protection, while our own economy, primarily because of the back-breaking cost of this Vietnam effort, is becoming steadily more mired down with increasing fiscal and monetary problems.

In recent days we have been led to understand that even more Americans will be needed to carry on this unfortunate war.

For over a quarter of a century we have had 40 percent as much of our Army in Europe as we now have in Vietnam.

I have read carefully every word of the 280 single-spaced pages of classified testimony which earlier this month the Secretary of Defense presented to the Senate Armed Services Committee. All of said testimony is interesting, but some of it has an Alice-in-Wonderland approach which, to my mind, has little relationship to reality; and which testimony makes some of us who have had some knowledge in this field over a period apprehensive about the future security of the United States.

A few days ago it was announced that the Government now plans to draft graduate students. That action can only shut off a great deal of the knowledge of those very sciences which could help us

preserve our deterrent capacity against the possible real enemy—the Soviet Union today, perhaps the Red Chinese tomorrow.

For these reasons, if there is to be a decision to send still more troops to this ravaged little Asian country, let us send the already trained men we have in Europe, rather than hastily trained youth from this country.

Perhaps I was the first in Congress to recommend a withdrawal of a major percentage of our troops in Europe. When working in the executive branch years ago we were assured they would be needed there for a maximum of 18 months.

In any case, and based on the Pentagon's own recent figures, if these troops in Europe are not utilized, and things in Vietnam get worse, there will not be much more than a corporal's guard of trained men left in the United States to defend this country.

What could be a greater incentive to start a chain of events which in turn could bring about the war all of us are so anxious to avoid—a nuclear exchange?

Under these conditions, I for one intend to work to the end that no money be either authorized or appropriated by Congress to support more than one American division in Europe.

## THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] raised a question yesterday about a petition filed with the National Labor Relations Board by the Kennecott Co. on October 18, 1967. He stated at that time that the NLRB usually settled cases of this nature in 60 days but that this particular petition had been on file for over 4 months. He was correct.

This morning I talked to the NLRB and asked the status of this petition. I did so because of the statement made by the Senator from Arizona and also on the basis of telephone calls I had received from Anaconda, Mont., vis-a-vis this matter. I was advised that the NLRB had gotten together all the material necessary and that this particular petition is under very intensive study and that it is their hope that it can be disposed of some time this week.

I was further informed that, in the opinion of my informant, the decision, whatever it might be, would not necessarily settle the strike but that it might "clear the air" so that the parties might start negotiating, depending on the type of decision rendered by the NLRB. There is, of course, the possibility that even then it could be and might be referred to the courts which would also be time consuming.

In regard to the talks I had with interested people in Anaconda, they told me that they had been informed that Kennecott and, perhaps, other copper companies would not start talking with the union until a decision on this petition was reached.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I wish to



commend the distinguished majority leader for following through on this very important matter which is vital not only to my State and his State, but also to the Nation. I think that the public interest demands that early action be taken by the General Counsel. I understand that the latter has not acted yet but I am hopeful he will do so immediately. I think we all realize the tremendous impact this situation is having on the Nation today.

I know the company and the union are not bargaining in this particular instance because of this holdup. I have been informed that at a meeting of the company and union held on February 26, the only issue was the union's companywide bargaining demand. That was yesterday. At this meeting, the union advised the company that its companywide bargaining demand would not be withdrawn. The company, in turn, advised the union that this insistence on companywide bargaining was frustrating negotiations and made a settlement with the union's dispute with Kennecott impossible. Despite this, the union refused to change its position.

This meeting lasted less than an hour and was adjourned by the Federal mediation and conciliation service with no further meetings scheduled.

I feel that the distinguished majority leader has aided considerably in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate and in insisting that the NLRB take early action. I express my appreciation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Arizona. However, he was the one who brought the matter to the attention of the Senate on yesterday. I knew nothing about it until the distinguished Senator from Arizona made his remarks and I heard from Anaconda.

Mr. FANNIN. I appreciate the Senator's help.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Arizona in urging that this administration take prompt steps to settle this long dispute in the copper industry.

I call particular attention to a notice that appeared on the UPI wire service yesterday, and I wish to read one sentence therefrom.

One of the Nation's largest defense contractors shut down two of its five plants today because of a shortage of materials resulting from a longshoremen's boycott of copper imports.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* the entire article to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

PASSAIC, N.J.—One of the Nation's largest defense contractors shut down two of its five plants today because of a shortage of materials resulting from a longshoremen's boycott of copper imports.

Okonite Co. closed operations at plants in North Brunswick and Providence, R.I. It also cut down operations at plants in Passaic

and Paterson, N.J., and Santa Maria, Calif.

A company spokesman said no copper was received at the plants this morning as a result of the boycott Friday by longshoremen in east and gulf coast ports to support the seven-month old nationwide copper workers strike. The firm has been using imported copper. The spokesman said the "flow of materials was slowed down."

The five plants employ about 2,000 workers but the company spokesman declined to say how many workers were turned away from their jobs this morning.

The North Brunswick plant makes rubber and plastic insulated copper wire. New Jersey copper users were making plans during the weekend to layoff workers if the boycott continued.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the point I wish to make is that some of our defense plants are being shut down as a result of a shortage of copper at a time when we are confronted with a full-scale war in Vietnam; yet, the administration is still twiddling its thumbs because it does not want to take action which under the law it has adequate authority to take. Some action should be taken. It is indefensible and inexcusable that we must shut down defense plants in the midst of a war because the administration does not have the political courage to act.

Mr. President, I compliment both of the Senators on their efforts to prod the administration on its negligence.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the copper strike has been in effect for too long—far too long as far as the miners, smeltermen, and their families in Montana and the other copper-producing States are concerned. It is time—long past the time—when the union and the companies should get together and put into practice what they have failed to do so far, and that is the true concept of free collective bargaining.

Along with other Senators from the Rocky Mountain States, I had asked the President to appoint a factfinding board which could come up with recommendations as to ways and means by which the strike could be settled. That factfinding board conducted hearings between the union and the four major copper producers: Kennecott, Anaconda, Phelps-Dodge, and American Smelting & Refining. That Presidential committee did come up with recommendations which, in my opinion, were at least negotiable, and those recommendations have been declined by the union. The copper companies have expressed disappointment at the action of the union, but they did not, themselves, say that they were willing to agree to the recommendations of the Presidential board. I would hope, therefore, that the union would reconsider the Presidential panel's proposal, and I would urge the copper companies to do likewise.

These recommendations may not be the answer, but they could, if both parties agreed to it, furnish a basis for collective bargaining on an around-the-clock, day-in-and-day-out procedure.

If the union and the companies do not get together—and I must say that my primary interest and concern are the miners, smeltermen, and their families

in Montana as well as the little businessmen who have been carrying them on their books for 7 months—then it appears to me that we have no one to turn to in behalf of the people whom we represent than the President of the United States. I reiterate, therefore, my suggestion that as a last resort, the President give serious consideration to calling both the companies and the union to the White House to see if this insoluble impasse cannot be broken and a satisfactory settlement achieved.

It has been a long, tough, hard winter in Montana, and the union members there have individually lost thousands of dollars in income, and the prospects look bleak unless a settlement is achieved. In the meantime, the five Western States of Montana, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and New Mexico have lost close to \$600 million in wages and tax revenues. The strike has cost the union an estimated \$8 to \$10 million to date. The price of copper has increased tremendously from the 38 cents per pound prestrike level. The shortage has become increasingly acute, and because of the importation of foreign copper and the high prices, our balance-of-payments deficit has been increased, in my opinion, well above the half billion dollar mark.

The strike is hurting everybody and benefiting nobody. It is time for the public interest to be given primary consideration. It is time for labor and management to get together. It is time to get the parties to the strike in the same room. It is time to lock them in, and as an editorial in the *Missoulian*, of Missoula, Mont., under date of February 21, says while such a procedure "won't be a love-in—it might get results."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the *RECORD* a telegram from John Kelly, president of the Anaconda Chamber of Commerce, and Mayor Henry Lussy, mayor of Anaconda, Mont.; an editorial from the *Missoulian*, of Missoula, Mont., of February 21; an editorial from the *Wall Street Journal*, entitled "Whither Do They Lead?" under date of February 27; and also a news story from the *Wall Street Journal* of the same date, entitled "Copper Shortage Prompts Calumet & Hecla to Almost Double Price, on Sliding Scale."

There being no objection, the telegram, editorials, and articles were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

ANACONDA, MONT.,  
February 26, 1968.

Senator MICHAEL MANSFIELD,  
U.S. Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

The need to find a way to settle our eight-month strike is eminent. At the present it seems to defy a solution but we feel that you, our Senator, have the ability to bring forth a settlement if all your energies are expanded toward this goal. Surely the heads of the five States mostly effected can come up with some way of getting management and labor together and get this strike settled. We are calling upon you now at the crucial hour to exercise your leadership ability in this matter. We feel that local and State problems that this strike has created are of grave importance to you and us. Our very existence is dependent upon a settle-

ment in the near future. At the polls we expressed our confidence in your leadership ability. We, the undersigned, are calling upon you now for your help.

JOHN KELLY,  
President, Anaconda Chamber of Commerce.

MAYOR HENRY LUSKY,  
Mayor of Anaconda, Mont.

[From the Missoula (Mont.) Missoulian,  
Feb. 21, 1968]

#### MIKE'S LOCK-IN TO END A STAY-OUT

The copper strike is in its eighth month and there is no end in sight.

A three-man presidential panel, which had been considering the stalemate for several weeks, admitted last Saturday that it could find no solution to the impasse. Like the negotiators before them, the panel members came a cropper on labor's insistent demand for and industry's adamant opposition to companywide bargaining.

However, the panel's efforts may not have been in vain. It did recommend a new format for continued negotiations, and received administration support in the persons of Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz and Commerce Secretary Alexander B. Trowbridge.

The panel format calls for each company to bargain in three groupings with the 26 unions involved. The first group would concern mining, smelting and refining operations. The second, lead and zinc production; and the third, copper wire and cable and brass fabrication.

The panel further recommended that bargainings concentrate on economic issues. But it gave labor a sop by adding that uniform contract "expiration dates and equality of treatment within these groupings" should be discussed.

Labor, through its chief spokesman, Joseph P. Molony, declared its disappointment with the plan. And industry didn't break out in cheers either.

Labor was disappointed because the panel rejected the principle of companywide bargaining. Industry gained a point in that the panel recognized the validity of the companies' argument that economic differences among the various operations prohibit company-wide bargaining. The unions, on the other hand, scored in the panel recommendation that the scope of bargaining be extended beyond the present format.

Now Montana's Sen. Mike Mansfield, who has continually prodded the administration to push for a strike settlement, proposes that President Johnson call the two disputants together and lock them up until they come to an agreement.

In this strike, as in every labor-management dispute, a third party at the bargaining table is public interest. For that reason Senator Mansfield's suggestion has merit.

Although the strike hits with greatest impact the states of Montana, Utah, Nevada, Arizona and New Mexico, its effects have extended to 60 plants in 23 states. More than 60,000 workers in those operations are idle, and thousands more have become victims of secondary unemployment.

In the five states most directly affected the loss in production wages and tax revenue has totaled \$530,000,000.

The strike has cost the unions an estimated 8 to 10 million dollars thus far.

The price of copper to domestic users has increased from 38 to 65 cents a pound for metal imported from abroad. This has forced up defense costs and raised the country's adverse balance of trade payments for copper from \$18 million to \$60 million a month.

This strike is costing everybody—labor, industry and the public. It's time it ended. Mansfield's lock-in—if it ever occurs—won't be a love-in but it might get results.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 27, 1968]

#### WHITHER DO THEY LEAD?

At least some of the striking copper workers must by now be getting a little dubious about their union leadership. Where, exactly, are the leaders leading?

While the workers voted to strike last July, some of them might have been hesitant if union officials had warned them that the walkout might drag on, as it has, for more than seven months. Officials themselves now concede that they seriously miscalculated the industry's will to resist.

Why are the companies so stubborn? The dispute mainly concerns not wages and benefits but rather the technique of bargaining. The unions want to negotiate on a basis that is at least company-wide if not nation-wide; the industry insists on retaining local contract talks.

The industry argues that its employees are not only scattered around the country but are engaged in a wide diversity of activities. In national bargaining, local problems sometimes get lost; that helps to explain why the United Auto Workers in recent years has been having trouble with rebellious union locals.

On the other hand, the unions claim local negotiations makes it possible for the companies to conquer the unions piecemeal. Even if that was so in the past, it's difficult to see what the labor leaders are afraid of now. The coalition of 26 unions, headed by the United Steelworkers, has shown no breakdown in discipline.

If in local talks the workers at one plant obtained terms agreeable to them, should they be forced to hold out for more simply because workers elsewhere remain dissatisfied? Plant-by-plant negotiations mean extra work for unions (and companies), but the results are more likely to satisfy the workers involved.

Besides seeming more interested in displaying their own power than in serving union members, copper labor officials also are proving inept in dealing with Government. Their incompetence was especially evident in their reaction to a Federal panel's proposal of a compromise bargaining formula.

In an effort to find some common ground between the industry and the unions, the panel proposed that copper operations be divided into three categories for purposes of bargaining. This would at least group together workers who are engaged in similar jobs.

Whatever the unions thought of the idea, a wise political play would have been to await company reaction. But the union officials flatly rejected the plan, which allowed industry leaders to come along saying nice things about the panel's proposal and bad things about the union intransigence—without ever firmly committing themselves for or against the suggested bargaining setup.

Union officials, of course, have contended right along that they want to impose their will upon the industry without the intervention of the Government. It's an odd preference, in a way, since such intervention in recent years usually has given the unions about all they've asked. In any case, the unions have especially opposed any move by Washington to seek a Taft-Hartley injunction to suspend the strike.

Since that's true, it's more than somewhat strange that the copper union welcomed the International Longshoremen's Association decision—later suspended, at least temporarily—to refuse to handle export and import shipments of the metal. Even if the ILA move was not an illegal secondary boycott, it would have made the strike's economic and national defense effort all the more crippling and thus made Taft-Hartley action all the more likely.

We don't for a moment doubt that copper

workers have, or are convinced that they have, serious grievances against their employers. No group of employees would have held ranks through this long, dismal strike if they were happy with the way they were being treated.

For solving these problems the workers need wise officials. Solutions will continue to be hard to find as long as their power-hungry leaders persist in running amuck.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 27, 1968]

#### COPPER SHORTAGE PROMPTS CALUMET & HECLA TO ALMOST DOUBLE PRICE, ON SLIDING SCALE

The current turmoil in copper supplies prompted one of the nation's few operating producers to raise its price drastically, and slash inventories of some major users to the crisis point.

Calumet & Hecla Inc., Evanston, Ill., today will begin pricing its copper on the fluctuating daily rate at the London Metal Exchange, which closed yesterday at nearly 84 cents a pound. This is nearly double the concern's former fixed price of 43 cents a pound.

Paul W. Robson, president, said the decision "was necessitated by the current extreme dislocation in normal domestic and world sources of supply." Calumet & Hecla reportedly produces only about 10,000 tons of refined copper a year, or less than 1% of the nation's total output, and has a fabricating capacity of about 200,000 pounds of copper and brass products a day.

The Illinois producer had posted its price of 43 cents only two weeks ago, when it became one of the few copper companies to reach a wage accord in the 228-day-old industry-wide strike. The price for domestic copper prior to the labor dispute was 38 cents a pound, and industry officials in mid-February said Calumet & Hecla's 5-cent boost was "around what most major producers would adopt" once a general settlement is reached.

Copper Range Co., a medium-sized producer that has also signed a new labor contract, changed to a system whereby its price varies each week once it resumed operations last month. The New York-based company is currently charging about 50 cents a pound.

Several copper-dependent manufacturers disclosed that they plan within the next two or three days to ask President Johnson to invoke an 80-day, back-to-work injunction under the Taft-Hartley Act to halt the prolonged copper strike. Many said their copper inventories were down to dangerous levels following the Government's freeze last week on domestic refined metal and a continuing slowdown on foreign deliveries resulting from an aborted gold boycott.

The Administration thus far has avoided any direct intervention in the politically sensitive labor situation. However, supplies are so low that the only alternative to White House action may be the closing of production lines throughout a number of basic industries, a number of companies asserted.

#### PRESSURE ON JOHNSON BUILDS

"The entire air-conditioning industry is living from hand to mouth on copper supplies, and employees are going to be laid off mighty soon if the Government doesn't act," commented an official of a leading maker of cooling equipment. Another major air-conditioning producer, Carrier Corp., indicated it probably will make a statement on the copper situation following today's annual meeting.

Additional pressure for White House action was building among some producers of electrical and electronic equipment and brass-fabricating concerns. Westinghouse Electric Corp., for instance, told the Commerce Department that, unless the situation changes, it might have to lay off employees at its



copper wire mills at Buffalo, N.Y., and Athens, Ga.

Okonite Co., a producer of wire and other electrical items, kept only a skeleton staff at its plants near Providence, R.I., and said it plans to completely close facilities at North Brunswick, and Passaic, N.J., after tomorrow. Late last week, when both domestic and foreign copper supplies became threatened, the Ling-Temco-Vought Inc. subsidiary had said it would be forced to close all five of its manufacturing installations and lay off 2,000 workers.

Still another category of sizable copper users—the Detroit auto makers—said copper inventories are satisfactory for the moment at least. American Motors Corp., for instance, said it has sufficient parts made from copper on hand to last through April, but "there could be trouble after then."

#### DOUBLE-BARRELED SUPPLY SQUEEZE

The probability of the Administration being asked for a strike-breaking injunction began developing last Thursday when a longshoremen's union announced it would boycott copper imports. Domestic users were hit almost immediately with a double-barreled supply squeeze when the Commerce Department the next day ordered all U.S. copper producers to halt civilian orders and fill only those carrying a military priority.

The dock boycott was called off over the weekend by the International Longshoremen's Association, which said the ban was put into effect prematurely through a secretarial error.

Yesterday, movement of copper from New York was "fluid and spotty," port officials said. Metal was moving normally via truck and barges at Brooklyn and Manhattan piers, but was delayed at times in both Port Newark and Port Elizabeth in New Jersey.

For example, Grace Line, a steamship concern serving the West Coast of South America, had some Chilean copper on its piers in New Jersey that workers refused to haul away. Three trucks arrived to pick up metal shipments. Two loaded up with zinc and departed, the third truck left empty.

In Washington late yesterday, a Commerce Department official said the department's order halting deliveries of copper for civilian use was still in effect "at this minute." Authorities were keeping a close watch on the dock situation and other elements of the worsening copper situation, but declined to speculate on whether the policy might be changed.

Preemption of all U.S. refined copper output for the defense needs was taken under the Defense Production Act of 1950 "in view of the prolongation of the copper strike and in the interests of the national defense," the department said. A telegram sent by Commerce officials to basic producers said the action was "a temporary measure" that will remain in effect "until further notice." At that time and subsequently the officials haven't directly mentioned the abortive longshoremen's boycott, which actually tipped the decision.

Department officials have said they will consider any requests "for adjustment or exemption" to the ban on civilian orders, and some industry sources said this might provide leeway for the air-conditioner makers and others who have reached a supply emergency. In technical terms, the department ordered producers to "accept all" orders carrying either basic military priorities or priorities of designated defense programs of the highest priority "for refined copper and to fill such orders from any refined copper produced for your account whether such refined copper was produced from copper raw materials produced in the U.S. or from copper raw materials derived from foreign sources or from scrap."

Producers were "also required immedi-

ately to withhold delivery on all nonrated orders for refined copper which you have heretofore accepted," the department said. Willful violation carries criminal penalties of up to one year in jail and a fine of up to \$10,000.

With about 60,000 workers on strike and more than 90% of the nation's copper production halted, consumers have been relying on foreign miners and dealers and the few domestic sources still operating. Supplies of refined copper fell to 88,000 tons in December from 221,000 tons in the like-1966 month due to the long walkout, according to the Commerce Department.

About 47,000 tons of the December supply, or more than one-half, came from overseas, principally Canada and Western Europe. Only about 18,000 tons of refined metal was produced from domestic ores that month, and the remaining 23,000 tons originated from reclaimed scrap.

Negotiations between the large copper companies and the unions are at a standstill. "It appears as though everybody—the producers, the unions and the customers—are looking for a strike solution out of Washington," remarked a high industry official.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly concur in the statement which has just been made by the distinguished majority leader.

This long drawn out copper strike has made a travesty of collective bargaining. Whatever obstacles have been put in the way of settlement of the strike, as far as the NLRB or any other agency of our Government is concerned, should be immediately resolved and we should go forward to settlement of this long drawn out strike.

As this strike developed, and I have observed it closely, I am not critical of the administration for not seeking relief under the Taft-Hartley Act and trying to get an injunction. In the first place, for the first time in my memory it may be that if the Government had gone in and asked for an injunction such a procedure would have been unsuccessful because they could not have shown there was the shortage that was necessary in the public interest to warrant such a procedure. It may be as this matter develops in the days and weeks ahead that such a procedure will be necessary.

Mr. President, the second thing I wish to mention is that I know the people of Montana. We have a fine, longtime labor tradition that goes back to the old Western States Association of Miners. Those people would go in for 80 days and come right back out and support their union. It is up to the union leaders and it is up to the officials of the four major companies to get together, to sit down, and actually bargain and negotiate. This is ridiculous, the fact that they are meeting for an hour or so and then adjourn for weeks or even months without discussion of the issues which can be reconciled and must be reconciled if the economy of the State of Montana and the Western States—the copper States—is not to receive a blow which will take a decade or more from which to recover.

Thus, I hope that if it takes a "love-in," or "lock-in," or any other thing, a

"sit-in," the officials of the company and the officials of the union will just sit down and go into hard collective bargaining and make it the actual business of the unions and the companies, as they are supposed to do in this democracy of ours.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in requesting that action be taken at once. I feel that the magnitude of this problem is not realized by most of the people of this Nation.

I differ with my colleagues as to the need for invoking the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. None of the 28 cases in which the Taft-Hartley emergency provisions have been invoked, in most instances, directly affected the welfare of this Nation as much as does the present copper strike. This copper strike has brought about great hardship and suffering of our people.

Let me bring one other matter to the attention of the Senate; namely, the amount of gold and silver which, as by-products of copper, has been lost during the 8 months of the copper mining shutdown.

Using the 1966 production of byproduct gold and silver, prorated over the 8-month period of the strike, and using a price of \$2 per ounce for silver and \$35 per ounce for gold, the lost production and consequent loss of our gold and silver stocks calculates to \$160 million.

This is yet an added reason why the President should take immediate action and invoke the emergency provisions of Taft-Hartley. We should consider not only the economic loss but also the tremendous loss to our defense; but we must also consider the suffering of those affected by the strike, who have been reduced to poverty because of lack of work not only in the mines, but also in allied industries.

I urge the attention of the Senate to this very serious matter, on which a decision needs to be made at once.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### ESTIMATED COST OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FACILITIES PROJECTS TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of the location, nature, and estimated Federal cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

##### ESTIMATED COST OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FACILITIES PROJECTS TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY AIR NATIONAL GUARD

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of the location, nature, and estimated Federal cost of certain additional facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

# PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1959

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## REPORT ON THE PROPOSED INCREASES IN ORDINARY CAPITAL RESOURCES OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, transmitting, pursuant to law, its special report on U.S. participation in a proposed increase in the authorized callable capital stock of the Inter-American Development Bank, February 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### THE BATTLE ACT REPORT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 20th report under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the need for improved controls in military departments to insure reimbursement for services provided to non-military and quasi-military activities, Department of Defense, dated February 26, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Water Resources Council, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Water Resources Planning Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PROPOSED LOAN TO KING HILL IRRIGATION DISTRICT OF KING HILL, IDAHO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a project proposal under the provision of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### PETITIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

A resolution of the American Mutual Insurance Alliance of Chicago, Ill., favoring the program recommended by the President's National Advisory Panel on insurance in riot-affected areas; and

A resolution of the National Education Association, of Washington, D.C., favoring enactment of the legislative proposals contained in the President's message on the crisis of the cities.

### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3032. A bill for the relief of Ting Shuen Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3033. A bill to increase the authoriza-

tion for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3034. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3035. A bill for the relief of Hamzi and Halima Aslani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3036. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mohammad Zafrullah Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3037. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan F. Sordo;

S. 3038. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael A. Santayana;

S. 3039. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando C. Ramos;

S. 3040. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose E. Naranjo;

S. 3041. A bill for the relief of Dr. Guillermo I. Gonzales;

S. 3042. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario E. Comas; and

S. 3043. A bill for the relief of Dr. Juan C. Arrabal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3044. A bill for the relief of Wong Kit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 3045. A bill to revise and extend section 317(a) of the Public Health Service Act to assure the continuation of various immunization programs authorized thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 3046. A bill for the relief of Pin-Yang Chen;

S. 3047. A bill for the relief of Renzo Maggini; and

S. 3048. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hae Cha Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S.J. Res. 147. A joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period March 3 through March 9, 1968, as "Circle K Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## S. 3033—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO INCREASE THE AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION FOR CONTINUING WORK IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill "to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. President, the Missouri River Basin project was first authorized as a part of the Flood Control Act of 1944. For the past few years Congress has required an authorization for the annual appropriations which have been requested to carry on this work. The legislation which I am introducing would

increase the appropriation authorization by \$59 million to carry on this project for fiscal years 1969 and 1970.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, together with the appropriate attachments, be included at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and appropriate attachments will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3033) to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior, introduced by Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter and attachments presented by Mr. METCALF are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The bill would increase by \$59 million the appropriation authorization for the portion of the Missouri River Basin project for which the Secretary of the Interior is responsible. This authorization is for appropriations to carry out the comprehensive plan of development on the project for fiscal years 1969 and 1970.

The Missouri River Basin project was begun with the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887), section 9(e) of which authorized the appropriation of \$200 million for partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken. Subsequent acts, most recently the Act of July 19, 1966 (80 Stat. 322), as amended by the Act of September 22, 1967 (81 Stat. 228), which authorized appropriations of \$68 million for fiscal years 1967 and 1968, have increased the funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out the comprehensive plan for the project. (A table of these authorization acts is enclosed.)

Since the current appropriation will expire on June 30, 1968, the additional authorization provided by this bill will be required early in this session of Congress to support the Administration's request for appropriations for fiscal year 1969.

The bill continues the provision of previous Missouri River Basin project appropriation authorization acts, beginning with the Act of August 14, 1964 (78 Stat. 446), that no new construction of any unit be initiated under this authorization. Excluded from the additional appropriation authorization provided in the bill are the Garrison Diversion unit and Nebraska Mid-State division of the Missouri River Basin project, which have been authorized with separate appropriation limitations.

The estimated program obligations for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 are shown in the enclosed tables.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH HOLM,  
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.



MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT  
STATUS OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ALLOTMENTS

Amount authorized to be appropriated:		Fiscal years 1967-68 authorization.....	\$68,000,000
Flood Control Act, Dec. 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887).....	\$200,000,000	Fiscal year 1967 net allotment.....	26,505,032
Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 641).....	150,000,000	Fiscal year 1968 appropriation.....	36,202,000
Flood Control Act, May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 170).....	200,000,000	Total.....	62,707,032
Flood Control Act, July 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 297).....	200,000,000	Estimated expired authorization, fiscal years 1967-68.....	5,292,968
Flood Control Act, July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 480).....	60,000,000	Fiscal year 1969 estimated allotment.....	31,119,000
Act of Dec. 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 842).....	16,000,000	Fiscal year 1970 estimated allotment.....	28,317,000
Act of Aug. 14, 1964 (78 Stat. 446) for fiscal years 1965 and 1966 only.....	120,000,000	Appropriation authorization required for fiscal years 1969-70.....	59,436,000
Act of July 19, 1966 (80 Stat. 322) as amended by act of Sept. 22, 1967 (81 Stat. 228), for fiscal years 1967 and 1968 only.....	68,000,000	Rounded.....	59,000,000
Total authorized to be appropriated to June 30, 1968.....	1,014,000,000		

Note: Included are Missouri River Basin investigations, continuing construction, and work on technical records and as-built drawings. Excluded are other Department of the Interior agencies and authorizations subsequent to the act of Aug. 14, 1964, which contain separate appropriation authorization.

ESTIMATED REQUIREMENT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1969 AND 1970

Unit or activity	Estimated requirement		Unit or activity	Estimated requirement	
	Fiscal year 1969 Federal obligations	Fiscal year 1970 Federal obligations		Fiscal year 1969 Federal obligations	Fiscal year 1970 Federal obligations
Glen Elder unit, Kansas.....	\$4,245,000	\$5,625,000	Drainage and minor construction—Continued		
Lower Marias unit, Montana.....	1,790,000	2,465,000	Helena Valley unit, Montana.....	\$165,000	\$260,000
Transmission division, Various.....	19,701,000	14,271,000	Owl Creek unit, Montana.....	75,000	75,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming.....	2,984,000	1,475,000	Sargent unit, Nebraska.....	270,000	335,000
Investigations, various.....	2,302,000	2,465,000	Technical records and as-built drawings.....	19,000	17,000
Drainage and minor construction:			Webster unit, Kansas.....	35,000	35,000
Ainsworth unit, Nebraska.....	371,000	0	Total, fiscal years 1969 and 1970.....	33,402,000	28,629,000
Almena unit, Kansas.....	74,000	201,000	Programs funded by contributions and prior-year appropriations.....	-2,283,000	-312,000
Bostwick division, Nebraska-Kansas.....	320,000	479,000	Appropriation authorization required for fiscal years 1969 and 1970.....	31,119,000	28,317,000
Cedar Bluff unit, Kansas.....	80,000	75,000	Total appropriation authorization required for fiscal years 1969 and 1970.....	\$59,436,000	
Crow Creek Pump unit, Montana.....	36,000	21,000	Rounded to.....	59,000,000	
East Bench unit, Montana.....	265,000	330,000			
Farwell unit, Nebraska.....	90,000	30,000			
Frenchman Cambridge division, Nebraska.....	497,000	470,000			
Hanover Bluff unit, Wyoming.....	83,000	0			

### S. 3034—INTRODUCTION OF BILL FOR THE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request of the Secretary of Transportation, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1969.

This bill includes all items of acquisition, construction, and improvement programs to be undertaken in fiscal year 1969 by the Coast Guard, even though Public Law 88-45 would require authorization only for major facilities and construction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the provisions of the bill be printed in the RECORD with the letter of transmittal from the Secretary of Transportation to the President of the Senate and a memorandum summarizing the various provisions of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3034) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### S. 3034

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for

fiscal year 1969 for the use of the Coast Guard as follows:

#### VESSELS

For procurement, extension of service life, and increasing capability of vessels, \$38,904,000.

##### A. Procurement:

- (1) one high-endurance cutter;
- (2) one oceanographic cutter;
- (3) one coastal buoy tender;
- (4) one ferryboat; and
- (5) one river tender and barge.

##### B. Increasing capability:

- (1) install generators and air conditioning on five seagoing buoy tenders;
- (2) improve habitability on two coastal buoy tenders;
- (3) install air conditioning on one coastal buoy tender; and
- (4) install balloon tracking radar on two high endurance cutters and modify balloon tracking radar installation on one high endurance cutter.

##### C. Extension of service life:

- (1) improve icebreakers; and
- (2) increase fuel capacity and improve habitability on high endurance cutters.

#### AIRCRAFT

For procurement of aircraft, \$14,636,000.

- (1) nine medium-range helicopters.

#### CONSTRUCTION

For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following, \$47,660,000.

- (1) Depot, Greenville, Mississippi: Barracks, messing, and operations buildings; garage; mooring facilities;
- (2) Moorings, Natchez, Mississippi: Mooring facilities;
- (3) Station, Suislaw River, Florence, Oregon: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building;
- (4) Station, Hobucken, North Carolina: Barracks, messing operations, and administration building; convert existing building to garage and storage building, improve facilities;

- (5) Moorings, Juneau, Alaska: Enlarge existing building to provide additional space for electronic spares shipping and receiving area, office space, and other purposes;

- (6) Station, Point Allerton, Hull, Massachusetts: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building; garage and workshop building; mooring facilities; helicopter pad;

- (7) Station, Grays Harbor, Westport, Washington: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building;

- (8) Station, Port Aransas, Texas: Repair and replace waterfront facilities;

- (9) Loran Station, Cape San Blas, Gulf County, Florida: Barracks building; convert existing building for messing and recreation spaces; enlarge loran building, garage and storage building;

- (10) Station, Bayfield, Wisconsin: Barracks, messing, and operations building, pier facilities;

- (11) Air Station, Mobile, Alabama: Barracks, BOQ and messing building; training, recreational, and exchange facilities, hangar space conversion;

- (12) Station, Cape Charles City, Virginia: Barracks, messing and operations building; mooring facilities, helicopter pad;

- (13) Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities;

- (14) Western Long Island Sound Development:

- (1) Station, New Haven, Connecticut: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building; mooring facilities;

- (11) Station, Eatons Neck, New York: Recondition barracks, operations, and administration building; improve waterfront facilities; and

- (111) Station, Fort Totten, New York: Recondition barracks, messing, administration, and work-storage facilities;

- (15) Base, Portsmouth, Virginia: Dredging, bulkheading, site development, utilities;

- (16) Station, San Francisco, California: Barracks building, administration building, subsistence building, waterfront facilities;

- (17) Yard, Curtis Bay, Maryland: Modify buildings as necessary to provide for consolidation of metal trades;

(18) Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico: Barracks and messing facilities, waterfront facilities renewal;

(19) Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Dock construction;

(20) Base, Galveston, Texas: Sewage system;

(21) Base, New York, Governors Island, New York: Sewage system;

(22) Station, Portsmouth Harbor, New-castle, New Hampshire: Mooring facilities; garage and workshop buildings;

(23) Various locations: Aids to navigation projects including, where necessary, planning and acquisition of sites;

(24) Arkansas River: Aids to navigation to complete marking of river;

(25) Various locations: Automation of manned light stations;

(26) Various locations: Replace lightships with very large buoys;

(27) Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Virginia: Galley/mess building;

(28) Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Virginia: Advanced Engineman School classroom and laboratory building;

(29) Training Center, Cape May, New Jersey: Gymnasium and recreation building;

(30) Training Center, Alameda, California: Recruit barracks;

(31) Training Center, Cape May, New Jersey: Medical-dental building.

(32) Various locations: Public family quarters;

(33) Various locations: Advance planning, construction, design, architectural services, and acquisition of sites in connection with projects not otherwise authorized by law; and

(34) Various locations: Automatic fixed-station oceanographic sensor systems and monitor buoys.

Sec. 2. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1969 for payment to bridge owners for the cost of alteration of railroad and public highway bridges to permit free navigation of the navigable waters of the United States in the amount of \$5,300,000.

Sec. 3. During fiscal years 1969 through and including 1970, the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is oper-

ating is authorized to lease housing facilities at or near Coast Guard installations wherever located for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such Coast Guard installations. Such housing facilities may be leased on an individual or multiple unit basis. Expenditures for the rental or such housing facilities may not exceed the average authorized for the Department of Defense.

The letter and memorandum presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,  
Washington, D.C. February 6, 1968.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a bill, "To authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard."

This proposal is submitted under the requirements of Public Law 88-45 which provides that no funds can be appropriated for or for the use of the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels or aircraft or the construction of shore or offshore establishments unless the appropriation of such funds is authorized by legislation.

This proposal includes, as it has previously, all items of acquisition, construction, and improvement programs for the Coast Guard to be undertaken in fiscal year 1969 even though the provisions of Public Law 88-45 appear to require authorization only for major facilities and construction. Inclusion of all items avoids the necessity for arbitrary separation of these programs into two parts with only one portion requiring authorization.

Not all items, particularly those involving construction, are itemized. Those involving aids to navigation, public family quarters, and advanced planning projects contain so many different particulars that their in-

clusion would have unduly lengthened the bill. As in the previous authorization Act, a separate section has been included for authorization of appropriations for payments to bridge owners for the replacement of bridges found to be presently obstructing free navigation on the navigable waters of the United States.

There has also been included an additional section continuing for the next two fiscal years the authority to lease housing facilities first included in Public Law 89-381. It had been anticipated that permanent authority would have been enacted prior to this time. However, the legislative proposal embodying this item is still being processed for submission to Congress. Since the Coast Guard is using this authority, its continuation until permanent legislation is enacted would be desirable.

In order to permit this authority to be used at overseas locations where similar problems regarding the adequacy and availability of housing exist, the language has been changed so as to permit the exercise of this authority at locations other than the United States and Puerto Rico. The limitation of the average authorized for the Department of Defense would still apply, however.

There is attached a memorandum listing in summary form the procurement and construction programs for which appropriations would be authorized by the proposed bill. In further support of the legislation, the cognizant legislative committees will be furnished detailed information with respect to each program for which fund authorization is being requested in a form identical to that which will be submitted in explanation and justification of the budget request. Additionally, the Department will be prepared to submit any other data that the committees or their staffs may require.

It would be appreciated if you would lay this proposal before the Senate. A similar proposal has been submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this legislation would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely,

ALAN S. BOYD.

Enclosure.

# SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1969 U.S. COAST GUARD PROGRAM FOR PROCUREMENT OF VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT AND FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SHORE AND OFFSHORE ESTABLISHMENTS

## VESSELS

For procurement, extension of service life, and increasing capability of vessels:

### A. Procurement:

(1) 1 high-endurance cutter.....	\$14,500,000
(2) 1 oceanographic cutter.....	14,500,000
(3) 1 coastal buoy tender.....	2,500,000
(4) 1 ferryboat.....	150,000
(5) 1 river tender and barge (see items below for construction of depot and moorings).....	829,000

### B. Increasing capability:

(1) Install generators and air conditioning on 5 seagoing buoy tenders.....	475,000
(2) Improve habitability on 2 coastal buoy tenders.....	160,000
(3) Install air conditioning on 1 coastal buoy tender.....	30,000
(4) Install 2 balloon tracking radars on high-endurance cutters and modify 1 balloon tracking radar installation.....	500,000

### C. Extension of service life:

(1) Improve icebreakers.....	4,260,000
(2) Increase fuel capacity and improve habitability on high endurance cutters.....	1,000,000

Total, vessels..... 38,904,000

## AIRCRAFT

For the procurement of aircraft: (1) 9 medium range helicopters..... 14,636,000

## CONSTRUCTION

or establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following:

(1) Depot, Greenville, Miss.: Barracks, messing, and operations building; garage; mooring facilities (see Vessels, item A(5) for associated tender and barge).....	165,000
(2) Moorings, Natchez, Miss.: Mooring facilities (see Vessels, item A(5) for associated tender and barge).....	128,000
(3) Station, Suislaw River, Florence, Oreg.: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building.....	307,000
(4) Station, Hobucken, N.C.: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building; convert existing building to garage and storage building, improve facilities.....	470,000

## CONSTRUCTION—Continued

For establishment or development of installations, etc.—Continued

(5) Moorings, Juneau, Alaska: Enlarge existing building to provide additional space for electronic spaces, shipping and receiving area, office space, and other purposes.....	\$213,000
(6) Station, Point Allerton, Hull, Mass.: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building; garage and workshop building; mooring facilities; helicopter pad.....	604,000
(7) Station, Grays Harbor, Westport, Wash.: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building.....	450,000
(8) Station, Port Aransas, Tex.: Repair and replace waterfront facilities.....	361,000
(9) Loran station, Cape San Blas, Gulf County, Fla.: Barracks building; convert existing building for messing and recreation spaces; enlarge Loran building, garage and storage building.....	267,000
(10) Station, Bayfield, Wis.: Barracks, messing, and operations building, pier facilities.....	326,000
(11) Air station, Mobile, Ala.: Barracks, BOQ and messing building; training, recreational, and exchange facilities, hangar space conversion.....	2,223,000
(12) Station, Cape Charles City, Va.: Barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities, helicopter pad.....	700,000
(13) Station, Annapolis, Md.: Barracks, messing, and operations building; mooring facilities.....	612,000
(14) Western Long Is. and Sound development.....	2,146,000
(i) Station, New Haven, Conn.: Barracks, messing, operations, and administration building; mooring facilities.	
(ii) Station, Eatons Neck, N.Y.: Recondition barracks, operations, and administration building; improve waterfront facilities.	
(iii) Station, Fort Totten, N.Y.: Recondition barracks, messing, administration, and work-storage facilities.	
(15) Base, Portsmouth, Va.: Dredging, bulkheading, site development, utilities, subsistence building, waterfront facilities.....	3,250,000
(16) Station, San Francisco, Calif.: Barracks building, administration building, subsistence building, waterfront facilities.....	3,039,000
(17) Yard, Curtis Bay, Md.: Modify buildings as necessary to provide for consolidation of metal trades.....	1,420,000
(18) Station, San Juan, P.R.: Barracks and messing facilities, waterfront facilities renewal.....	1,300,000
(19) Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Dock construction.....	850,000
(20) Base, Galveston, Tex.: Sewage system.....	100,000
(21) Base, New York, Governors Island, N.Y.: Sewage system.....	2,500,000
(22) Station, Portsmouth Harbor, Newcastle, N.H.: Mooring facilities; garage and workshop buildings.....	1,047,000



SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1969 U.S. COAST GUARD PROGRAM FOR PROCUREMENT OF VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT AND FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SHORE AND OFFSHORE ESTABLISHMENTS—Con.

## CONSTRUCTION—Continued

For establishment or development of installations, etc.—Continued	
(23) Various locations: Aids to navigation projects including, where necessary, planning and acquisition of sites.....	\$2,400,000
(24) Arkansas River: Aids to navigation to complete marking of river.....	125,000
(25) Various locations: Automation of manned light stations.....	591,000
(26) Various locations: Replace lightships with very large buoys.....	1,000,000
(27) Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Va.: Galley-mess building.....	1,005,000
(28) Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Va.: Advanced engineman school classroom and laboratory building.....	369,000
(29) Training Center, Cape May, N.J.: Gymnasium and recreation building.....	2,697,000
(30) Training Center, Alameda, Calif.: Recruit barracks.....	1,400,000
(31) Training Center, Cape May, N.J.: Medical-dental building.....	2,100,000
(32) Various locations: Public family quarters.....	8,000,000
(33) Various locations: Advance planning, construction, design, architectural services, and acquisition of sites in connection with projects not otherwise authorized by law.....	4,035,000

## CONSTRUCTION—Continued

For establishment or development of installations, etc.—Continued	
(34) Various locations: Automatic fixed station oceanographic sensor systems and monitor buoys.....	\$1,450,000
Total, construction.....	47,660,000
Sec. 2. Alteration of bridges:	
(1) Berwick Bay Bridge (near Morgan City, La.).....	3,270,000
(2) Calumet River railroad bridges (near Chicago, Ill.).....	2,530,000
Total, bridges.....	5,800,000

## S. 3045—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL FOR THE VACCINATION ASSISTANCE ACT EXTENSION OF 1968

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, when President Kennedy first proposed the Vaccination Assistance Act in his 1962 message to the Congress on national health needs, he said:

There is no longer any reason why American children should suffer from polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, or tetanus—diseases which can cause death or serious consequences throughout a lifetime, which can be prevented, but which still prevail in too many cases.

When President Kennedy signed the Vaccination Assistance Act into law on October 23, 1962, he set in motion a massive immunization campaign, which has to date protected millions of American children against the suffering, permanent damage, and death these diseases bring.

In 1965, President Johnson recommended in his message to Congress on the Nation's health that this immunization program be continued. The Congress responded, extending the program to June 30, 1968, and added measles vaccinations as an eligible activity.

I think it is impossible to overstate the value of these immunization campaigns. The average number of polio cases in each year between 1954 and 1964 was 38,476. That number is now down to about 100 per year. Similar results obtained in diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus—all because of the community immunization programs authorized by this legislation.

But we still have far to go in stamping out measles—a disease which each year kills over a hundred children and leaves many hundreds of others with lasting handicaps, including hearing disorders and mental retardation.

Before the new measles vaccine became available in 1964, about 4 million measles cases were reported every year. That figure has been dramatically reduced, as roughly 21 million children aged 1 to 12 years have been vaccinated since 1964 with assistance from this program.

But Dr. William Stewart, the U.S. Surgeon General, reported last September that some 6 million children are without vaccinations and still susceptible to measles—and it is these children at whom my bill is aimed. Present law contains restrictions which may prevent them from being reached, and consequently the legislation needs amendment to extend the Surgeon General's authority. Under the present law the pro-

gram is limited to preschool children; it should be extended to all children now served by the school vaccination programs.

The legislation also needs amendment to include rubella—German measles—as an eligible disease for immunization campaigns. German measles reach epidemic proportions every 7 years in this country, and 1970 will be one of these years. In 1970, 600,000 pregnant women will be exposed to rubella, and fully one out of three women who contract rubella will have children with such illnesses as deafness and mental retardation. By 1969, an effective vaccine to protect against rubella will be available, and it should consequently be included as eligible for assistance under this mass immunization program.

For these reasons, I am today introducing a bill to extend the Vaccination Assistance Act for another 5 years, and to set the authorization at \$11 million per year. This will assure that community vaccination programs are continued until all children have been effectively protected against measles, and give State health departments the time to prepare for rubella immunization programs.

Complete immunization is a goal within our grasp; we should not step back from it.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a memorandum on the program's success in Massachusetts be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3045) to revise and extend section 317 (a) of the Public Health Service Act to assure the continuation of various immunization programs authorized thereunder, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## S. 3045

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Vaccination Assistance Act Extension of 1968."*

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1969, subsection (a) of section 317 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for each of the next four fiscal years, to enable the Secre-

tary to make grants to the States and, with the approval of the State health authority, to political subdivisions of instrumentalities of the States under this section. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1974, shall be available for making such grants during the fiscal year for which appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year. Such grants may be used to pay that portion of the cost of immunization programs against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, measles, and rubella which is reasonably attributable to (1) purchase of vaccines needed to protect such groups of children as may be described in regulations of the Secretary upon his finding that they are not normally served by school vaccination programs, and (2) salaries and related expenses of additional State and local health personnel needed for planning, organizational, and promotional activities in connection with such programs, including studies to determine the immunization needs of communities and the means of best meeting such needs, and personnel and related expenses needed to maintain additional epidemiologic and laboratory surveillance occasioned by such programs. Such grants may also be used to pay similar costs in connection with immunization programs against any other disease of an infectious nature which the Secretary finds represents a major public health problem in terms of high mortality, morbidity, disability, or epidemic potential and to be susceptible of practical elimination as a public health problem through immunization with vaccines or other preventive agents which may become available in the future."

The memorandum presented by Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts is as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,

Boston, February 1, 1968.

## To Local Boards of Health:

This is our report to you on the status of measles in Massachusetts for the year 1967. You will recall that the statewide Measles Eradication Program was launched in January 1966, with emphasis on the immunization of preschool children. For the fiscal year 1967, the objective was to immunize every susceptible school child by April 1, 1967. Of the 351 cities and towns of the state, 252 met this deadline.

The program this year is geared to the immunization of any preschool or school child missed in the previous two programs. With the support of the Massachusetts Medical Society and the assistance of clinical and public health medicine measles is on its way to extinction.

Tabulated below are the measles cases reported in Massachusetts for the calendar years 1965-67:

1965	19,512
1966	853
1967	420

Thus, in two calendar years, you and the physicians in private practice were able to effect a 97.9 per cent reduction in measles. If we continue at this rate measles can be eradicated by June 30, 1968.

There is another aspect of the Measles Eradication Program which will interest you. As a consequence of the marked reduction in measles, not only were children saved from having the disease with its dreaded complications, but the people of Massachusetts also realized a substantial dividend on their investment.

The following table illustrates the direct cost of medical care for measles in Massachusetts. These costs do not include any losses of income by parents or other indirect costs, and do not include what it would cost the Commonwealth to support and educate a child who has become retarded because of measles encephalitis.

APPROXIMATE DIRECT COSTS FOR MEASLES IN MASSACHUSETTS (BASED ON USPHS FORMULA MMWR, APR. 15, 1967)

	Number of patients	Medical expenses
Jan. 1-Dec. 31, 1965	19,512	\$343,020.96
Jan. 1-Dec. 31, 1966	853	14,995.74
Jan. 1-Dec. 31, 1967	420	7,383.60

If we did not have the measles vaccine or an immunization program, the direct costs of caring for measles in Massachusetts from January 1, 1966 to December 31, 1967, based on the average number of cases expected in Massachusetts (5 year median) would have been in excess of \$787,689.48. Each year which follows will further increase the savings realized by the people of Massachusetts.

Both clinical and public health medicine may justifiably be proud of their efforts to eradicate measles.

Very truly yours,

NICHOLAS J. FUMARA, M.D., M.P.H.,  
Director, Division of Communicable Diseases.

Approved.

ALFRED L. FRECHETTE, M.D., M.P.H.,  
Commissioner, Department of Public Health.

DONALD A. NICKERSON, M.D.,  
President, Massachusetts Medical Society.

#### SUMMARY OF REPORTED CASES OF MEASLES

Counties	1965	1966	1967
Barnstable	167	6	15
Berkshire	1,453	22	13
Bristol	1,359	64	27
Dukes	2	1	1
Essex	3,230	40	39
Franklin	194	11	4
Hampden	1,535	26	12
Hampshire	379	20	13
Middlesex	3,323	274	91
Nantucket	0	0	0
Norfolk	1,107	19	29
Plymouth	2,376	14	20
Suffolk	2,138	108	97
Worcester	2,194	176	36
Military	55	72	23
Total	19,512	853	420

#### BARNSTABLE COUNTY

Barnstable	99	2	0
Bourne	12	0	0
Brewster	0	0	0
Chatham	16	0	0
Dennis	0	0	0
Eastham	15	0	0
Falmouth	22	1	0
Harwich	0	0	0
Mashpee	0	0	0
Orleans	0	0	0
Provincetown	0	3	15
Sandwich	1	0	0

#### SUMMARY OF REPORTED CASES OF MEASLES—Con. BARNSTABLE COUNTY—Continued

	1965	1966	1967
Truro	0	0	0
Wellfleet	0	0	0
Yarmouth	2	0	0
Total	167	6	15

#### BERKSHIRE COUNTY

Adams	116	0	0
Alford	6	0	0
Becket	0	0	0
Cheshire	0	0	0
Clarksburg	0	0	0
Dalton	0	0	1
Egremont	12	0	0
Florida	0	0	0
Great Barrington	68	0	2
Hancock	0	0	0
Hinsdale	0	0	0
Lanesborough	0	0	0
Lee	0	0	0
Lenox	0	0	0
Monterey	2	0	0
Mount Washington	0	0	0
New Ashford	0	0	0
New Marlboro	0	0	0
North Adams	69	1	0
Otis	0	9	1
Peru	0	0	0
Pittsfield	1,071	9	7
Richmond	5	0	0
Sandisfield	0	0	0
Savoy	0	0	0
Sheffield	63	3	2
Stockbridge	0	0	0
Tyringham	3	0	0
Washington	0	0	0
West Stockbridge	21	0	0
Williamstown	17	0	0
Windsor	0	0	0
Total	1,453	22	13

#### BRISTOL COUNTY

Acushnet	133	5	2
Attleboro	107	2	4
Berkley	0	0	0
Dartmouth	104	1	4
Dighton	14	0	2
Easton	1	0	1
Fairhaven	16	0	0
Fall River	352	10	7
Freetown	52	0	0
Mansfield	74	1	0
New Bedford	223	5	0
North Attleboro	17	0	0
Norton	0	0	0
Raynham	1	0	3
Rehoboth	0	0	0
Seekonk	5	1	0
Somerset	7	0	0
Swansea	58	0	1
Taunton	130	35	2
Westport	65	4	1
Total	1,359	64	27

#### DUKES COUNTY

Chilmark	0	0	0
Edgartown	2	0	0
Gay Head	0	0	0
Gosnold	0	0	0
Oak Bluffs	0	1	1
Tisbury	0	0	0
West Tisbury	0	0	0
Total	2	1	1

#### ESSEX COUNTY

Amesbury	0	0	0
Andover	207	10	3
Beverly	140	1	0
Boxford	7	0	0
Danvers	430	0	0
Essex	0	0	0
Georgetown	91	0	0
Gloucester	55	1	0
Groveland	55	0	1
Hamilton	0	0	2
Haverhill	364	7	8
Ipswich	0	0	0
Lawrence	203	0	1
Lynn	612	8	4
Lynnfield	16	0	0
Manchester	80	0	0
Marblehead	203	0	1
Merrimac	0	0	0
Methuen	1	1	2
Middleton	14	0	0

#### SUMMARY OF REPORTED CASES OF MEASLES—Con. ESSEX COUNTY—Continued

	1965	1966	1967
Nahant	59	0	0
Newbury	1	0	0
Newburyport	0	0	0
North Andover	0	0	1
Peabody	118	3	15
Rockport	34	0	0
Rowley	0	0	0
Salem	229	3	0
Salisbury	4	0	0
Saugus	80	0	0
Swampscott	218	5	1
Topsfield	6	0	0
Wenham	2	1	0
West Newbury	1	0	0
Total	3,230	40	39

#### FRANKLIN COUNTY

Ashfield	1	0	0
Barnardston	0	0	0
Buckland	1	1	0
Charlton	36	1	0
Colrain	0	0	0
Conway	0	0	0
Deerfield	0	0	1
Erving	0	0	1
Gill	29	0	0
Greenfield	28	9	1
Hawley	12	0	0
Heath	4	0	0
Leverett	1	0	0
Leyden	0	0	0
Monroe	0	0	0
Montague	12	0	0
New Salem	15	0	1
Northfield	0	0	0
Orange	2	0	0
Rowe	3	0	0
Shelburne	0	0	0
Shutesbury	0	0	0
Sunderland	0	0	0
Warwick	0	0	0
Wendell	0	0	0
Whately	0	0	0
Total	194	11	4

#### HAMPDEN COUNTY

Agawam	115	1	1
Blandford	0	0	0
Brimfield	1	0	0
Chester	0	0	0
Chicopee	63	2	0
East Longmeadow	29	0	0
Granville	0	0	0
Hampden	11	0	0
Holland	0	0	0
Holyoke	77	2	0
Longmeadow	24	1	1
Ludlow	366	3	1
Monson	22	0	1
Montgomery	0	0	0
Palmer	57	0	0
Russell	3	0	0
Southwick	0	0	0
Springfield	405	7	2
Tolland	0	0	0
Wales	0	0	0
West Springfield	128	7	5
Westfield	227	3	1
Wilbraham	7	0	0
Total	1,535	26	12

#### HAMPSHIRE COUNTY

Amherst	14	7	1
Belcher town	77	0	0
Chesterfield	20	0	0
Cummington	21	0	0
Easthampton	75	7	6
Goshen	2	0	0
Granby	0	0	2
Hadley	0	3	1
Hatfield	0	0	0
Huntington	0	0	0
Middlefield	0	0	0
Northampton	79	3	1
Pelham	0	0	0
Plainfield	0	0	1
South Hadley	15	0	1
Southampton	0	0	0
Ware	2	0	0
Westhampton	1	0	0
Williamsburg	72	0	1
Worthington	1	0	0
Total	379	20	13



## SUMMARY OF REPORTED CASES OF MEASLES—Continued

## MIDDLESEX COUNTY

	1965	1966	1967
Acton.....	38	0	1
Arlington.....	372	1	0
Ashby.....	0	0	0
Ashland.....	49	0	0
Ayer.....	0	3	5
Bedford.....	20	55	0
Belmont.....	112	3	3
Billerica.....	0	0	0
Boxborough.....	0	1	1
Burlington.....	60	1	1
Cambridge.....	181	24	9
Carlisle.....	0	0	0
Chelmsford.....	3	1	0
Concord.....	0	0	0
Dracut.....	1	0	0
Dunstable.....	0	0	0
Everett.....	306	1	1
Frammingham.....	105	2	2
Groton.....	0	2	1
Holliston.....	17	62	4
Hopkinton.....	2	1	0
Hudson.....	12	0	0
Lexington.....	9	2	3
Lincoln.....	1	0	2
Littleton.....	3	0	0
Lowell.....	54	1	5
Malden.....	441	0	0
Marlborough.....	9	0	0
Maynard.....	3	3	0
Medford.....	14	2	1
Melrose.....	0	0	0
Natick.....	194	6	2
Newton.....	73	4	2
North Reading.....	258	1	3
Pepperell.....	0	0	11
Reading.....	88	0	1
Sherborn.....	0	1	0
Shirley.....	5	0	1
Somerville.....	111	3	7
Stoneham.....	101	5	1
Stow.....	2	80	0
Sudbury.....	4	0	1
Tewksbury.....	23	1	0
Townsend.....	2	0	0
Tyngsboro.....	3	0	0
Wakefield.....	63	1	0
Waltham.....	112	0	12
Watertown.....	330	0	6
Wayland.....	22	2	4
Westford.....	10	2	0
Weston.....	7	1	0
Wilmington.....	8	0	0
Winchester.....	48	1	0
Woburn.....	37	1	1
Total.....	3,323	274	91

## NANTUCKET COUNTY

Nantucket.....	0	0	0
----------------	---	---	---

## NORFOLK COUNTY

Avon.....	0	1	0
Bellingham.....	0	0	0
Braintree.....	11	0	2
Brookline.....	93	2	1
Canton.....	0	0	0
Cohasset.....	46	0	0
Dedham.....	26	0	0
Dover.....	0	0	0
Foxborough.....	53	0	1
Franklin.....	68	1	1
Holbrook.....	10	0	0
Medfield.....	26	0	0
Medway.....	0	0	0
Millis.....	0	0	0
Milton.....	34	0	0
Needham.....	47	7	2
Norfolk.....	0	0	0
Norwood.....	0	0	0
Plainville.....	0	0	0
Quincy.....	295	2	5
Randolph.....	36	0	7
Sharon.....	107	2	5
Stoughton.....	48	0	0
Walpole.....	3	0	0
Wellesley.....	94	3	4
Westwood.....	2	0	0
Weymouth.....	74	1	1
Wrentham.....	34	0	0
Total.....	1,107	19	29

## PLYMOUTH COUNTY

Abington.....	31	1	3
Bridgewater.....	129	0	0
Brockton.....	1,028	6	12
Carver.....	112	0	0
Duxbury.....	0	0	0
East Bridgewater.....	157	1	0

## SUMMARY OF REPORTED CASES OF MEASLES—Continued

## PLYMOUTH COUNTY—Continued

	1965	1966	1967
Halifax.....	0	0	0
Hanover.....	40	1	0
Hanson.....	38	0	0
Hingham.....	37	0	0
Hull.....	12	0	0
Kingston.....	6	0	0
Lakeville.....	201	0	0
Marion.....	33	0	0
Marshfield.....	106	1	0
Mattapoisett.....	37	0	0
Middleborough.....	0	0	0
Norwell.....	0	0	5
Pembroke.....	19	3	0
Plymouth.....	287	1	0
Plympton.....	0	0	0
Rochester.....	0	0	0
Rockland.....	58	0	0
Scituate.....	19	0	0
Wareham.....	6	0	0
West Bridgewater.....	20	0	0
Whitman.....	0	0	0
Total.....	2,376	14	20

## SUFFOLK COUNTY

Boston.....	1,415	04	96
Chelsea.....	40	0	0
Revere.....	16	1	0
Winthrop.....	667	3	1
Total.....	2,138	108	97

## WORCESTER COUNTY

Ashburnham.....	24	4	3
Athol.....	11	0	6
Auburn.....	165	0	0
Barre.....	0	0	0
Berlin.....	0	12	0
Blackstone.....	0	0	0
Bolton.....	1	19	0
Boylston.....	0	0	3
Brookfield.....	0	0	0
Charlton.....	0	0	0
Clinton.....	4	10	0
Douglas.....	38	0	0
Dudley.....	0	0	0
East Brookfield.....	0	0	1
Fitchburg.....	4	6	1
Gardner.....	31	2	0
Grafton.....	91	2	0
Hardwick.....	0	0	0
Harvard.....	0	1	0
Holden.....	29	0	0
Hopedale.....	4	0	0
Hubbardston.....	0	0	0
Lancaster.....	0	61	0
Leicester.....	0	0	0
Leominster.....	5	0	1
Lunenburg.....	2	0	1
Mendon.....	3	0	0
Milford.....	38	1	0
Milbury.....	220	0	0
Millville.....	0	0	0
New Braintree.....	0	0	0
North Brookfield.....	0	0	0
Northborough.....	0	0	0
Northbridge.....	18	3	0
Oakham.....	0	0	0
Oxford.....	0	0	0
Paxton.....	4	3	0
Petersham.....	0	0	0
Phillipston.....	0	0	0
Princeton.....	3	0	0
Royalston.....	0	0	0
Rutland.....	11	0	0
Shrewsbury.....	45	4	0
Southborough.....	56	4	0
Southbridge.....	168	0	1
Spencer.....	40	0	0
Sterling.....	0	18	0
Sturbridge.....	19	0	0
Sutton.....	0	0	3
Templeton.....	17	0	0
Upton.....	67	1	1
Uxbridge.....	0	0	0
Warren.....	43	0	0
Webster.....	9	0	0
West Boylston.....	0	0	0
West Brookfield.....	1	1	0
Westborough.....	0	2	0
Westminster.....	12	2	0
Winchendon.....	0	0	0
Worcester.....	1,011	20	15
Total.....	2,194	176	36

## MILITARY

Bedford Air Force Base.....	0	0	0
Chelsea Naval Hospital.....	0	1	2
Fort Devens.....	55	71	21
Otis Air Force Base.....	0	0	0
Westover Air Force Base.....	0	0	0
Total.....	55	72	23

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO SALE OF DEFENSE ARMAMENTS TO REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

## S. CON. RES. 60

Whereas the Republic of South Africa is not hostile to the United States, nor an enemy of the United States either under international law, or the laws of the United States;

Whereas the Republic of South Africa was an ally of the United States in World War I, World War II, Korea and the Berlin crisis and continues to support U.S. policy in Vietnam;

Whereas United States citizens continue to be warmly welcomed in the Republic of South Africa and American businessmen enjoy free trade and full consular privileges and diplomatic recognition exists between the United States and the Republic of South Africa;

Whereas the Republic of South Africa has repaid all war debts and is one of the few countries in Africa which pays her own way and receives no United States aid and trade between the two countries has been running at a very favorable balance in favor of the United States;

Whereas the withdrawal of British military forces east of Suez and the closing of the Suez Canal have increased the strategic role of the Republic of South Africa;

Whereas Communist aggression in the Middle East and Asia has both increased and intensified and the Republic of South Africa has expressed a desire to play an active role in halting the expansion of communism.

Whereas the Republic of South Africa allows missile tracking stations of the United States to be located on her soil, and ships, both civilian and naval of the United States free access to her ports and facilities;

Whereas it is to the best interest of the United States to support her allies and to join with them in mutual programs for defense and the protection of free commerce: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that it is the sense of Congress of the United States that the United States Government immediately cease its unfair, harmful, arbitrary and costly policy of prohibiting the sale of military goods to the Armed Forces of the Republic of South Africa in keeping with the needs of the Republic of South Africa in maintaining her defense against aggression and to allow the Republic of South Africa to be militarily prepared to defend the sea routes, coast line and other areas vital to maintaining peace in the world, and to allow the Republic of South Africa to continue effective support as an ally of the United States.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG], I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of amendment No. 530 to the bill (H.R. 15399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

# NOTICE OF HEARING ON COURT OF CLAIMS BILL (S. 1704)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce a hearing for the consideration of S. 1704. This bill would authorize the Court of Claims to implement its judgments for compensation.

The hearing will be held on March 12, 1968, at 9 a.m. in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, room 6226, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

# NOTICE OF VETERANS' HEARINGS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has been authorized to conduct hearings on March 5, 6, and 7, in room 4232, New Senate Office Building, on S. 2910, S. 2911, and S. 2937.

S. 2910 will provide incentives to returning veterans to take public service jobs in areas where they are needed the most. For example it will encourage veterans to teach in poverty areas, to work on undermanned fire and police forces and in understaffed hospitals, and to participate in VISTA, the Teachers Corps and other domestic programs. The Veterans' Administrator would be authorized to select geographical and job areas of critical need.

The incentives would include: First, right to additional period of educational assistance under the cold war GI bill; second, on-the-job training assistance allowance; and third, \$50 per month supplement to educational assistance for training in preparation for a qualifying public job.

S. 2911 will make vocational training available to veterans on a part-time as well as a full-time basis. This will help the veterans who need and deserve rehabilitation but cannot attend full time, and it will enable veterans to contribute as workingmen while receiving part-time training.

S. 2937 will increase the maximum guarantee on GI home loans from \$7,500 to \$10,000. The maximum has not been raised for 18 years, and the proposed increase would bring the 1950 figure up to date.

The March 5 to 7 hearings will be open, and statements from knowledgeable individuals and organizations will be welcome for the hearing record.

# NOTICE OF FURTHER HEARINGS ON S. 2766, A BILL AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO RESTRICT TRAVEL TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as chairman of the ad hoc Subcommittee on Passport Legislation of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to an-

nounce that there will be another public hearing to receive testimony on S. 2766, a bill "authorizing the Secretary of State to restrict the travel of citizens and nationals of the United States where unrestricted travel would seriously impair the conduct of foreign affairs." The hearing will be held on March 8, 1968, beginning at 9 a.m. in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building.

Any persons wishing to testify on this bill should communicate with Mr. Arthur M. Kuhl, the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

# CORRUPT MILITARY REGIME IN SAIGON NOW GOVERNS BY DECREE AND FORCE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the gleaming white marble Embassy building in Saigon, which was completed last September, and which cost our Government approximately \$3 million, has the outside appearance of a huge white walled fortress. It is surrounded by a wall of reinforced concrete 8 feet in height and 6 inches in thickness. In addition, there is the fenced-off public gate with a guardhouse. Always, at least two U.S. military policemen are on guard there.

Less than 5 months from the completion of this imposing Embassy building, which takes up most of the space of a ground area of 3 acres, the Embassy grounds were invaded by the Vietcong. The reinforced concrete surrounding wall was broken by a mortar shell. Vietcong soldiers rushed into the grounds. American marines, officials, and soldiers were killed trying to evict the invading force. Little help came from the South Vietnamese police of friendly forces, so-called. It was evident that the South Vietnamese Armed Forces were too impotent or too cowardly to defend our Embassy from invasion. Consider for a moment our unfortunate predicament if we failed to have an adequate force of policemen of the U.S. military to prevent invasion of the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Of course, there is no possibility that the United States would fail to protect the embassy of any foreign nation. That is a highly important duty and obligation of every government to all foreign embassies and consulates. The prestige of any nation who would fail to give such protection would plummet to a new low.

The buildings on the Embassy grounds consist of a main building, staff residence house, which also is used as a guest house for generals, State Department officials, Senators and other visitors, personnel building, generator house, and administration and consular building. This embassy complex was held by the enemy for 6½ hours before they were driven out. To our humiliation, Ambassador Bunker was compelled to leave hurriedly for his own safety.

Although I made definite inquiry of the State Department to ascertain the total number of American officials and employees attached to the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, and also the total number of Vietnamese nationals employed there, these accurate figures have been denied me to this time. It was stated by tele-

phone by an official of the State Department that these figures were not available at the present time. I report that as of February 1, 1968, the total number of American officials and employees in our Embassy in Saigon, the capital of what is known as South Vietnam, with a population of approximately 14 million people, exceeded in total number all American officials and employees in any other U.S. Embassy in the world, including our Embassies to India, the United Kingdom, France, or Spain. Also the number of South Vietnamese nationals employed in the U.S. Embassy in Saigon exceeded the total number of nationals employed in any of these Embassies.

The cost of our Embassy buildings in Saigon totaled \$47 per gross square foot. It is noteworthy that the U.S. Embassy constructed in London in 1960 cost per gross square foot only \$16.63. That in Madrid, constructed in 1955, cost \$15.18 a gross square foot. Our Embassy at New Delhi, India, in 1958 cost \$11.22 per gross square foot, and the office building annex at New Delhi, constructed about the same time the staff residence house and other buildings were constructed in Saigon cost \$16.10 per gross square foot. Our U.S. Embassy in Tokyo was constructed at a cost per gross square foot of \$10.19. The cost of our Embassy in Saigon is a tremendous excess cost over the cost of construction of other U.S. Embassy buildings.

It is absurd to claim the cost of Vietnamese labor is three times that of Labor in London, Madrid, and Tokyo. It is not possible construction materials abundant in Southeast Asia cost three times as much in Saigon as in New Delhi and other capitals. This excessive cost per gross square foot of the Saigon Embassy indicates there was profiteering, graft, or theft of huge quantities of construction materials in connection with the building of our Embassy in Saigon. It is apparent to any observer, as it was to me during my recent visit to South Vietnam, that the Saigon military junta is corrupt from the top down and that theft, bribery and corruption have infested all aspects of the Government of South Vietnam from the top right down to the provincial capitals, and corruption and extortion is rampant throughout the South Vietnam military particularly among the generals and colonels.

It is noteworthy that President Thieu has declared martial law and that he and Vice President Ky are governing by decree the same as do Communist regimes. Three thousand political prisoners in jail in Saigon, most of whom had never been tried, were released by the Vietcong during their last successful invasion of Saigon.

Since then Thieu and Ky have arbitrarily seized and thrown into jail former candidates for President, venerable Buddhist leaders and a number of so-called neutralists. Their police regime does not have popular support. They know it. Like all ruthless dictators they are using every means to hold on.

Very definitely instead of escalating and expanding our immoral and un-American ground and air war in Vietnam, a sane American policy would be to disengage and gradually withdraw our



forces to coastal bases and at the same time seek a cease-fire and armistice by diplomatic means.

#### ORDERLY ADMINISTRATION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM IN ARKANSAS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Col. Willard A. Hawkins, State director of the Selective Service System in Arkansas, has forwarded me copies of correspondence which he has exchanged with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. In this correspondence Colonel Hawkins explains that, in Arkansas, no "registrants have been reclassified for any reason as a means of punishment," and that Arkansas has "had no demonstrations of any kind, either around induction stations, military recruiting stations, or on the campus at any of our universities and colleges."

I am pleased to note the orderly administration of the Selective Service System in Arkansas, and I ask unanimous consent that Senator KENNEDY's letter of February 13 addressed to Colonel Hawkins and Colonel Hawkins' reply of February 19 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., February 13, 1968.

Col. WILLARD A. HAWKINS,  
Federal Office Building,  
Little Rock, Ark.

DEAR COLONEL HAWKINS: I have for some time been concerned with the operation of the Selective Service laws, as you may know. I am not convinced that the laws we now have—and which you must administer—are as fair to all our young men as they should be, or as they could be.

Another of my concerns has been the October 26, 1967 letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, General Lewis B. Hershey, concerning reclassification as delinquents of individuals who "interfere" with the draft process. I am sure I need not review the arguments—legal and other—surrounding that letter, as they have been spelled out at length in material available to you. Of particular interest, however, is the second circuit case of *Wolff v. Selective Service Board No. 16,372 F. 2d 817* (1967).

I would very much appreciate it if you would furnish me with information relating the number of registrants reclassified by the local boards under your jurisdiction, pursuant to General Hershey's October 26 letter. Many of us in Congress hold a deep concern about this matter, and I would, as I say, appreciate your furnishing me with this information.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,

Little Rock, Ark., February 19, 1968.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I received your letter of February 13 today and I regret that I am unable to provide the information you seek, principally because we have no knowledge that any registrants have been reclassified for any reason as a means of punishment. We can advise you of the following, as a matter of general information.

Thus far, we have had no demonstrations

of any kind, either around induction stations, military recruiting stations, or on the campus at any of our universities and colleges.

We regret that we cannot offer any more constructive information than is contained in this letter.

Thank you for letting us hear from you.

Sincerely,

WILLARD A. HAWKINS,  
Colonel, U.S. Air Force, State Director.

#### LETTER TO EDITOR OF NEW YORK TIMES FROM PRESS OFFICER OF PERMANENT MISSION OF THAILAND TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have received a press release from the permanent mission of Thailand to the United Nations which gives the text of a letter dated February 5, 1968, from the press officer of the mission to the editor of the New York Times. The press release states that the letter has not been published.

The press officer of the Thai Mission to the United Nations, commenting on an article by Sydney Gruson in the New York Times, has written that—

The disappointment and even resentment felt by many Thai people stem from the unfair treatment and lately, the campaign of vilification, which have been meted out to Thailand by certain elements of the American Press.

The letter goes on to assert that—

The campaign of distortion and slander was launched by those who oppose the policy of U.S. involvement in Asia and particularly in Vietnam.

The Thai press officer's letter also disputes Mr. Gruson's contention that "The Thai press is strictly controlled by the Government" and states:

On the contrary, it is a fact that a sector of the Press in this country is in the hands of a handful of people who try to impose their views and opinions on the general public.

Mr. President, I question whether the disappointment and resentment felt by many Thai people, to which the press officer's letter refers, is due to articles which have appeared in the American press. The article by Mr. Gruson, to which the Thai press officer's letter refers, notes that the most violent hostility to the United States has been expressed not in the American press but in an article which appeared in the Thai newspaper, the *Siam Rath*. I also question the assertion of the letter that the American press is "in the control of a handful of people who try to impose their views and opinions on the general public." And I challenge the implication that Thailand's press is freer than ours.

Mr. President, I assume that the letter from the press officer of the Thai mission to the United Nations was distributed as a mission press release because the mission wished the letter to have the widest possible circulation. I accordingly request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, together with the article by Sydney Gruson to which the letter refers.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Press release of the permanent mission of Thailand to the United Nations, Feb. 14, 1968]

#### RIGHT OF DISSENT NOT OBSERVED BY NEW YORK TIMES

Following is the content of the letter dated February 5, 1968, from the Press Officer of the Mission to the Editor of the New York Times which has not been published: "Once again the facts are deplorably misrepresented in Sydney Gruson's article entitled 'Thais vent anger over United States build-up.'"

"In reality, the disappointment and even resentment felt by many Thai people stem from the unfair treatment and lately, the campaign of vilification, which have been meted out to Thailand by certain elements of the American Press. Those 43,000 American fighting men who are accorded hospitality on Thai soil have behaved reasonably well and have caused little, if any, friction. The present frictions have been caused, rather, by those who are not doing the fighting and may not, even have sufficient courage to fight.

"The campaign of distortion and slander, as it is well known, was launched by those who oppose the policy of United States involvement in Asia and particularly in Vietnam. They use every devious means to show that Vietnam is unworthy of United States support and assistance. Recently, they repeatedly made tendentious reports, suggesting that the United States was also getting 'bogged down' in Thailand despite consistent denials that Thailand has ever had any intention of asking American manpower to fight communist activities in our country. Furthermore, the American soldiers now stationed in Thailand are not engaged in combat duties against the communists in Thailand but are actively fighting the Vietnam war from our territory so as to save American lives. Such a campaign has been staged by those people who, in spite of their unjustifiable claims to bring 'liberals', are in fact undeniable racists. They do not want to see cordial relations exist between the United States and nations of Asia and Africa and they would go to any extent to embroil and possibly to destroy good relations. In the case of Thailand, they have not even hesitated to level false charges against our Monarch whose dedication to and concern for the well-being of the people are well known in our country and to whom, as many observers have correctly pointed out, the Thai nation looks up as the embodiment of its unity and stability.

"Another indication that the New York Times correspondent's report is sadly lacking in accuracy can be seen in his categorical contention that 'The Thai Press is strictly controlled by the Government.' This, to say the least, is blatantly false. Kukrit's newspaper, the *Siam Rath*, for one, is on record for having vehemently criticized members of the Thai Government, including the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister. Is this a characteristic of a Government-controlled Press? On the contrary, it is a fact that a sector of the Press in this country is in the control of a handful of people who try to impose their views and opinions on the general public."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 5, 1968]

#### THAIS VENT ANGER OVER U.S. BUILDUP—AMERICAN OFFICIALS PUZZLED BY RECENT PUBLIC HOSTILITY

(By Sydney Gruson)

BANGKOK, THAILAND, February 3.—The underlying hostility felt by many Thais to the build-up of United States military and civilian personnel in Thailand has exploded into the open in recent weeks, causing official American concern and also bafflement over how to meet the problem.

Relations at the official level remain proper.

In many individual cases they are close and good. But the American impact on the Thai society and economy is beginning to be felt at nearly all levels as Thailand's commitment in the war in Vietnam war increases.

There are about 43,000 American military men and about 7,000 civilians in Thailand on a more or less permanent basis, four-fifths of them involved in the air war against Vietnam. There are also about 5,000 American soldiers from Vietnam on rest and recreation each month.

#### IMPACT IS EVIDENT

The American impact is easy to see in Bangkok, with a population of more than two million, but it is even more evident in the small towns near the huge Air Force bases on which most of the 33,000 Air Force personnel live.

Thailand's need to line up firmly on the United States in Vietnam does not seem in question in the increasingly public debate over the American presence here. The Government recently committed itself to raising the number of Thai combat troops in Vietnam from 3,000 men to a full division, or 12,000 to 13,000.

A critical book about Thailand by Louis Lomax, a free-lance writer and a radio and television commentator in Los Angeles, sparked the current criticism of the American presence. As read by the Thais, the book, entitled "The War That Is, the War That Will Be," insulted King Phumiphol Aduldet and indicated that Thailand was ripe to become another Vietnam.

#### IRKED BY NEWSWEEK ITEM

An item in the magazine Newsweek, which the Thais felt impugned the King's courage on a visit to the northeastern insurgency area, sharpened the hostility. But many Americans here feel that the violence of the reaction disclosed deep feelings that had only awaited an excuse to be aired.

The most violent hostility was expressed in the writings of a respected journalist, Kukrit Pramoj, who had never been considered anti-American but is distantly related to the royal family. Some Americans here try to dismiss Mr. Kukrit's outburst as a momentary fit of temper, but he has deliberately refrained from taking anything back in the exchanges with readers that his attack provoked.

Writing last December in his paper Siam Rath, Mr. Kukrit blamed the Americans for practically every evil in Thai social and economic life and referred to them as "mung," a word of contempt in Thai used instead of "they" or "you."

If the Americans were not careful, he said, the Thais might one day "smash down your Embassy and burn down the United States Information Service." He concluded his lengthy article: "You American beasts, return to your holes."

#### ACCUSED OF EXPLOITATION

According to Mr. Kukrit, the Americans detest the Thais because the United States has only relatively recently freed itself from colonial status while Thais have always been independent. "It is a characteristic of slaves to prefer fellow slaves," he said.

He accused the United States of economic exploitation, of seeking to destroy Thai independence and of destroying the nation's economy. He said American troops were not only creating vast numbers of prostitutes but were also teaching Thai boys "to indulge in sexual perversion."

"It is frankly admitted," he wrote, "that every one in six American men is a sexual pervert."

The Thai press is strictly controlled by the Government, an authoritarian, military-led administration. No one in the Government sought to correct the impression that Mr. Kukrit's article might have spread.

#### READERS DISPUTE VIEW

Some readers did, however, pointing out that an economy that was moving ahead at an annual growth rate of 8 per cent was not being destroyed. They also criticized him for generalizing about Americans because of the possible bad behavior of a few soldiers.

When the few Thais who have regular social contact with Americans are asked what it is they dislike about the American presence here, they usually lead off, as Mr. Kukrit did, with criticism of soldiers holding girls' hands or kissing girls in public. Next there usually is comment on the proliferation of euphemistically called "massage" parlors, as though Americans and not Thais ran the parlors.

No one seems to know why the Thais do not forbid the parlors.

The outburst by Mr. Kukrit and others led the American Ambassador, Leonard Unger, to issue a statement that the people writing books and articles about Thailand were "definitely not speaking for the United States Government or for the American people."

In a speech to the American Chamber of Commerce last month, the Ambassador warily took up the issue again.

#### SERIOUSLY TROUBLED

"In the crossfire of political battles over Vietnam," he said, "many Americans naturally want to examine our commitments elsewhere in the area."

"I do not quarrel with the usefulness of responsible free debate," he added. "I am seriously troubled, however, when I see certain facts about Thai-United States cooperation misread in ways that damage Thai-American interests and encumber the Vietnam problem with negative and discouraging implications which do not actually exist."

"Having governed themselves for over 700 years," Ambassador Unger continued, "the Thai feel no need to adjust their way of doing things to meet foreign concepts of how things should be done. Moreover, having decided that defending Vietnam is in Thailand's own best interests, they do not want their actions interpreted—or misinterpreted—in lights cast by the clash of conflicting views over similar United States policies."

"Understandably, they resent the bland assumption that the pattern of events in a neighboring state inevitably will be repeated in their own," he said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### VIETNAM CONCLUSIONS BY ARTHUR Z. GARDINER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post, published February 20, Mr. Arthur Z. Gardiner, who has been directly involved with events in Vietnam since 1958, first as director of our economic aid program and later as head of the International Voluntary Services, sets forth his views about the war. Mr. Gardiner has a rare perspective from which to observe developments in that unfortunate country, and I believe that his comments will be of interest, and, perhaps, enlightenment, to my colleagues and other readers of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### VIETNAM CONCLUSIONS

As one who has been intimately connected with events in South Vietnam since early in 1958, as Director of Economic Aid for four years, and most recently for three years as Executive Director of International Voluntary Services, Inc., with 165 young volunteers now in Vietnam under my direction, who frequently report to me facts and opinions based on intimate contacts in South Vietnam, it is my duty to express these views and conclusions:

1. Anti-Americanism, hate for America, is a basic fact of life in most of Vietnam today. It arises from the overbearing presence of 500,000 Americans, mostly young, some have made good friends with the Vietnamese, though most have not, and a disastrous few have caused bitter resentments; from contempt of the so-called Vietnamese "elite" who are profiteering; from jealousy of the Vietnamese officials displaced in practice by American civil and military "advisers"—who no longer advise, but who administer, from military tactics of bombing, firing, defoliation, which have uprooted nearly a quarter of the civilian population from ancestral homes and prosperous farms.

2. Constructive efforts toward what we all would like to see in Vietnam—a prosperous and peaceful country—are doomed if they must depend on the leadership of an unstable little-respected military clique; the election to office by a small minority vote in the last election has not given the authority or charisma which true leadership in a Southeast Asian country requires.

3. Increasing numbers of Vietnamese are becoming benevolently neutral toward the Vietcong—race, religion, xenophobia, all contribute.

4. The war will not "peter out"; it may become dormant again, but so much damage, material and moral, has been caused since 1965 that Vietnamese patriots will never be content until foreign influence has been eliminated from the government of their country.

5. Official Americans in Vietnam caught up in action programs of all sorts, naturally enthusiastic and ebullient, naturally trustful, have been poor reporters of the scene, and they more and more have become prisoners of their own rhetoric and jargon, desirous as most of them are to submit progress reports satisfactory to their superiors.

6. We must agree to withdraw from Vietnam on terms enabling us to save the lives of those who have reason to fear retribution if American soldiers can no longer protect them—(not necessarily as large a group as are killed by the war in a few months time); and to a settlement by the Vietnamese themselves, Northern and Southern, under conditions of order satisfactory to them and to the international community.

ARTHUR Z. GARDINER.

McLEAN.

#### "WE CAN GET OUT OF VIETNAM"—ARTICLE BY GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an extremely interesting and well-written article by Gen. James M. Gavin, entitled "We Can Get Out of Vietnam."

As the Senate knows, we have had General Gavin before the Committee on Foreign Relations on two occasions. General Gavin's experience goes back to the period in which the first involvement of this country, in a very minor way, took place under the administration first of President Truman and later of General Eisenhower.



In presenting his views on Vietnam, General Gavin writes from a unique background, since he played such a major role in preventing U.S. military involvement there in 1954. It is most unfortunate that his wise counsel of 14 years ago was subsequently rejected.

I urge my colleagues to read General Gavin's article.

I particularly also wish to call the attention of my colleagues, in connection with this article, to the statements, and especially the book, of General Ridgway. I believe General Ridgway was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He was the Chief of Staff of the Army at the time he and General Gavin were instructed to make an investigation of the feasibility and wisdom of intervention with American arms during the period about 1954. It is noteworthy that after a thorough investigation, with a competent staff, they recommended that it was not a feasible undertaking and they recommended against the United States becoming involved in a military way in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that General Gavin's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WE CAN GET OUT OF VIETNAM

(By James M. Gavin, in collaboration with Arthur T. Hadley)

Vietnam is the least understood conflict in our nation's history. We have committed more than 480,000 troops and the might of our air and sea power. We have fought skillfully and bravely. Yet "victory" is nowhere in sight. Will more troops bring a quicker victory? More air strikes?

Unfortunately, there will be no "victory" in Vietnam. Only more victims. This is the difficult and unfortunate truth we have yet to understand. To see the Vietnam problem, we must first trace briefly the history of our involvement there, and then set Vietnam in the context of our present military and diplomatic capabilities. When we have done that, we may not have "victory" but we can at least plan toward a successful conclusion of the war.

Before beginning this study of the Vietnamese situation, I want to make one point absolutely clear. On the level of combat itself Vietnam is the best fought war in our history. I have watched officers and noncoms leading the troops in the field, and they are highly professional, the troops start out well-trained, battle-ready Americans, whatever they think of the conflict, can be proud of these soldiers and their dedication. Let no debate on Vietnam divide us from the knowledge of our soldiers' courage. The errors of his tragic war are made not on the battlefield but in Washington.

My own involvement with Vietnam began in 1954. I was then Chief of Plans of the Army, serving under Matthew B. Ridgway, the Chief of Staff. I had served with him in the past, a man of incisive intelligence and great moral courage, a good man to work for.

In 1954 the French in Vietnam were involved at Dienbienphu. They had dug into this isolated fortified area to provoke the Viet-minh into a major battle in which the Communist troops would be destroyed. But then it became clear that the battle was not going as the French had planned. They stepped up their already tremendous demands on the United States for war material.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff had been doubtful about the Dienbienphu strategy from the beginning. I felt that genuine French concessions to make Vietnam independent were far more important than mere firepower.

As the situation at Dienbienphu worsened, the French in desperation asked us for carrier strikes against the attacking Communists. Adm. Arthur W. Radford, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a strong advocate of carrier air power, favored this. So did Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and Adm. Robert B. Carney, Chief of Naval Operations. There was even talk of using one or two nuclear weapons. Our allies, sounded out by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, were opposed. General Ridgway believed that the air attacks would be indecisive, and that they would lead to involvement of American ground troops. We in the Army felt that this was a war that America certainly did not want.

Ridgway carried his disagreement to President Eisenhower, who finally decided against the air strike. I am convinced that Ridgway, along with our allies, played a crucial role in aborting this 1954 effort to involve us in Vietnam.

Dienbienphu fell on May 7. The next day the French and the Vietminh met in Geneva and—with speed that surprised us in the Pentagon—agreed to end the war. They wrote the Geneva accords of July, 1954, partitioning Vietnam at the 17th parallel into North and South Vietnam, and providing for nationwide elections to be held by July 20, 1956, to decide the nature of reunification.

To understand what happened next, it is important to understand the attitude of the Pentagon in 1954, because this attitude produced the initial decisions that led to where we are in Vietnam today and because this attitude is still all too prevalent in our military thinking.

In 1954 the Korean War controlled Pentagon thinking. For the Air Force it had been a disillusioning and frustrating experience. They had assumed that air power would demolish the North Korean military. They had trumpeted this point of view to the public and to the President. When bombing failed to halt the North Korean war effort, the Air Force developed the myth of the Yalu sanctuary. If only they could bomb Manchuria, beyond the Yalu, everything would turn out all right. Thus, at least in public, the Air Force was able to avoid confronting the evidence that in Korea air power had failed, strategically and tactically. Unfortunately, from their frustration sprang a readiness to reply to any challenge to American power with threats of total nuclear war.

To the Army, Korea had been embittering and costly. Of the more than 147,000 casualties, most had been in the ground forces. Despite the Army's wealth of combat experience, abundant logistical support and modern equipment, major units had been surprised and routed by Chinese forces. We felt that more Korea-type wars—wars fought out on the ground—were a possibility, and that we should have funds to train and equip ourselves for them. Instead, we were beginning to feel the pressure of the "new look" cutbacks that flowed out of the doctrine of massive retaliation. Our funds and troop strengths were slashed, while the forces for strategic nuclear bombing were built up.

In addition all of us in the Pentagon—and I include myself—tended to see the world in terms of good guys and bad guys. It was a simple vision, and in the era of Stalinism it held much truth.

Still, we should have been wiser. We assumed that Peking was a pawn of Moscow, that Russia—thwarted in Europe by NATO and the Marshall Plan—was on the march in Asia. The Communist world was assumed to be an integrated, monolithic block. Only a few of us were beginning to distinguish between the nationalistic Communism of Tito and the Stalinism of Russia. And even fewer extended that concept to Ho Chi Minh's brand of Communism in Vietnam. The whole idea was near-heresy, but the fact was that Communism was changing; the future would show that there were brands

of nationalistic Communism with which the United States could quite safely coexist.

This was the Pentagon atmosphere as we followed the Geneva talks. We felt that the French, despite the lavish support they had had from us, were acting almost entirely out of self-interest—protecting French investments—rather than in the interest of democracy as a whole.

With the folding of the French the Pentagon staff assumed that the burden of fighting Communism in Asia had now fallen upon the United States. Secretary of State Dulles and the CIA agreed with the Pentagon. At that time Secretary Dulles was building a paper wall of treaties to contain Communism. The Joint Chiefs began a high-priority study of a proposal to send combat troops into the Red River Delta of North Vietnam.

It was my responsibility as Chief of Plans of the Army Staff to recommend a position for the Army. I began by bringing in Asian experts. We had to face the fact that if we entered North Vietnam we were, in effect, going to war with Red China. Red China would be providing most of the arms, vehicles and ammunition, and would feel that our move was a threat to her national self-interest.

(Let me reiterate: the Army staff and I wanted no war with Red China. We argued forcefully and frequently against such a war. We simply considered the alternatives.)

The Army staff anticipated a bloody and costly war that would engage a tremendous portion of our manpower and resources, at the expense of our obligations in other parts of the world and at home.

As they had during the Dienbienphu crisis, the Joint Chiefs divided. Admiral Radford strongly favored landing a force in the Haiphong-Hanoi area, even at the risk of war with Red China. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of Naval Operations supported him.

In my opinion the risk of war would have been great. Just southeast of Haiphong harbor is the island of Hainan, which is actually part of Red China. The Navy was unwilling to risk ships in the Haiphong area without first taking the island.

Once more the embattled Ridgway dissented. Using the staff study we had prepared in the Army, he wrote directly to President Eisenhower, pointing out the hazards of a war in Vietnam. Again, fortunately, the President decided not to commit U.S. forces to Southeast Asia.

However, there was a compromise. We decided to support what we hoped would be a stable, representative, independent government in South Vietnam. The fact that this was contrary to the Geneva accords seemed irrelevant.

We thought then that our most serious problem was the selection of a premier for South Vietnam, to serve under the technical head of state, Emperor Bao Dai. The job fell to Ngo Dinh Diem.

I visited Saigon early in 1955 to discuss political- and military-aid matters. I met Diem, who struck me as very nonpolitical, self-centered and quite unresponsive to the needs of his people. Nonetheless, the Defense Department, the State Department and the CIA supported him. Once more we were acting from honest conviction: The world was black and white, no gray in between. We had stopped Communism in Europe. We had stopped it in Korea. Now we were going to stop it at the 17th parallel in Vietnam.

On July 16, 1955, the Diem government announced—with American backing—that it would not comply with the provision of the Geneva accords calling for free elections. The reason given was that free choice was impossible in the North. In supporting Diem in this, the United States violated its own unilateral "Declaration of Support for the Geneva Conference."

At the time of Diem's announcement there-

still were significant numbers of French troops in South Vietnam. But thereafter the French began thinning out rapidly. On October 26, 1955, Premier Diem deposed the absentee Emperor Bao Dai and became the first president of the Republic of South Vietnam. President Eisenhower wrote to Diem offering U.S. assistance "in maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression." Later President Eisenhower explained that this meant aid only. And during his Administration the U.S. Military Advisory and Assistance Group did not increase significantly; it averaged 650 men.

President Kennedy began to occupy himself with Southeast Asia immediately after his inauguration. By then the resistance movement in South Vietnam by the National Liberation Front, or Viet Cong, had gained strength.

My growing concern with the doctrine of "massive retaliation" and American over-reliance on nuclear weapons led me to resign in 1958. With the election of President Kennedy I returned to government service as Ambassador to France. Early in the Kennedy Administration the United States accepted the independence of Laos, led by Prince Souvanna Phouma, whom many in our Government believed to be Communist-controlled if not outright Communist. During the negotiations I met several times with Souvanna Phouma in Paris, at the request of President Kennedy, to persuade him that he could trust the United States.

While Laos then is not Vietnam now, there are distinct parallels. The Laotian experience convinced me of the need to work with national leaders of all political persuasions, as we had with Tito in Yugoslavia. Laos also convinced me of the fallacy of the falling-domino theory. Laos went neutral. Neither Cambodia nor Thailand fell.

In the meantime things were not going well with Diem's government in Vietnam, though we were doing our verbal best to help him. Vice President Johnson, visiting there in 1961, referred to Diem as the "Churchill of today." Yet the Diem government became more isolated and oppressive. And by 1963 the war in Vietnam also was going very badly. President Kennedy was having grave doubts about our course of action (we now had more than 15,000 men there). Recent books have indicated the depth and bitterness of the division in the Kennedy Administration over Vietnam.

The President himself stated publicly:

"In the final analysis it is their war. They are the ones that have to win it or lose it. We can help them, give them equipment. We can send our men out there as advisers. But they have to win it."

However, the President's military advisers continued to tell him the war was going well. On October 2, 1963, after another quick Vietnam trip, McNamara insisted that the President issue the following statement:

"The military program in South Vietnam has made progress and is sound in principle, though improvements are being energetically sought. . . . Secretary McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the United States military task can be completed by the end of 1965. . . . They reported that by the end of this year [1963] the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point that one thousand U.S. military personnel assigned to South Vietnam can be withdrawn."

There has been much speculation about what President Kennedy would or would not have done in Vietnam had he lived. Having discussed military affairs with him often and in detail for 15 years, I know he was totally opposed to the introduction of combat troops in Southeast Asia. His public statements just before his murder support this view. Let us not lay on the dead the blame for our own failures.

By 1964 Vietnam had become a major political issue in the presidential campaign. (There were, by then, 23,000 U.S. troops there, mostly advisers. President Johnson said: "We aren't going to send American boys nine thousand or ten thousand miles away to do what the Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves.")

In August of 1964, in circumstances still not totally clear, two U.S. destroyers were attacked in Tonkin Bay by North Vietnamese PT boats. In the excitement following the attack, Congress, at the behest of the Administration, adopted the Southeast Asia (Tonkin Bay) Resolution upon which the Administration bases its actions today. On February 7, 1965, the first air strikes were ordered against North Vietnam. On March 6, U.S. Marines were ordered to land in the Danang area, north of Saigon. By October of 1965, American forces in South Vietnam totaled 132,300.

At this time it was already perfectly clear to me that as a military operation Vietnam made no sense. It was obvious that bombing was not going to bring Ho Chi Minh to his knees. This was the lesson of World War II bombing—German war production actually rose despite the devastating attacks. And more immediately to the point—it was the lesson learned by the British in the war they won against Communist guerrillas in Malaya. The British high command began bombing suspected guerrilla areas but stopped when they found that the bombing's indiscriminate brutality alienated the people and strengthened the guerrillas.

It followed, then, that to get our "victory" we would have to commit an ever-growing number of ground troops. But this is no panacea either. There are definite contributions that ground troops, handled with sophistication, can make in a guerrilla war, but if the people of the country like the guerrillas better than they like the government that the foreign troops are supporting, the mere pouring in of more and better-equipped ground troops won't win the war.

As the government at Saigon did not appear to have this popular support, I believe the war would not go well, and that when this became clear the Pentagon and certain sections of Congress would call for more troops and heavier bombing until we escalated into a direct confrontation with Red China. This could lead directly to a nuclear World War III.

With this grave concern I tried in my own mind to develop some strategy that could stop the escalation and end the war. I evolved in 1965 what has come to be known as the "enclave" strategy. And I promptly found myself at the center of violent controversy. I believe that the enclave strategy is even more valid today than it was in 1965. Combined with a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam, it would constitute a vital first step in our de-escalation of the war.

I reasoned that a primary tactical problem, once a war occurs, is to keep it limited. This is particularly true of a war in which we should not have become involved, and in which U.S. interests are, at best, marginal. Therefore I sought a way to halt the buildup, hold what we had, and open negotiations for peace.

By the fall of 1965 the United States had built up enclaves—vast logistical facilities at Cam Ranh Bay, Danang, Saigon and other places. If we concentrated in these centers, we could immediately stop the ever-increasing inflow of U.S. troops and probably reduce the number of men involved. At the same time, we could encourage the development of democracy in the large areas dominated by these enclaves, and could help the South Vietnamese bring their own troops to a high standard of combat performance.

While doing this, we could search for a diplomatic solution of the war, using our hold on the big enclaves as a decisive counter in the bargaining.

I fully realize the problems of negotiating with the N.L.F. and the North Vietnamese. They are a tough, determined foe. They have fought the Japanese, European colonists, and Americans for more than 20 years. Our knowledge of them is distorted by distance and by propaganda—ours and theirs.

The Hanoi government has several times stated its position on ending the war, probably most significantly in the four points laid down by Premier Pham Van Dong on April 13, 1965:

1. In accordance with the Geneva Agreement, the United States must withdraw from South Vietnam United States troops, military bases, etc.

2. Pending the peaceful reunification of Vietnam, the provisions of the 1954 Geneva Agreement pertaining to no military alliances, foreign bases, etc., must be respected.

3. The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled in accordance with the N.L.F. program.

4. The peaceful reunification of Vietnam is to be settled by the Vietnamese people in both zones, without any foreign interference.

Hanoi had indicated on several occasions that these points were a basis for talks rather than preconditions. Their more recent statement was that would talk if the bombing stopped.

Meanwhile, the war assumes a distinct Orwellian character. Images of violence and blood flash into our living rooms on TV screens. The goal and principles for which we began the conflict lie close to forgotten. Brave men die. Experts in Vietnam told me privately that the war could last 5 to 10 more years. Yet both sides seem to lack the will, or the ability, the extricate themselves from the nightmare.

We seem to have forgotten that one of the vital aspects of a limited war is that it be limited in time also. A war may involve a minor portion of the total resources of a nation and may be limited to a small area; but if it goes on for four or five years at a reasonably intense level, it is not truly limited.

A Vietnamese solution, based on a "free, neutral and independent" nation—on the pattern of Laos—should be acceptable in Vietnam. Such a government, without ties to China, the Soviet Union or the West, would be in the best interests of Vietnamese and Americans. I do not believe that Ho Chi Minh ever wanted to be a puppet or satellite of China, or of Russia. The information we have indicates he is a patriot, an intense nationalist, albeit a Communist—a Tito.

In Vietnam, war forces the N.L.F. into dependence upon Hanoi, and Hanoi into dependence on China and Russia. This compromises not only the prospects for peace but also the independence of any post-peace action by the N.L.F. Thus our military action tends to create the very Communist monolith we entered the war to avoid.

We should take extraordinary diplomatic steps to get fruitful negotiations. The President should appoint, with the advice of the Senate, a special cabinet-level official of great stature to negotiate with the N.L.F. and Hanoi. The sole responsibility of this official should be termination of the war. He should be served by his own staff, free from bureaucratic interference and the burden of past positions. With a reasoned military strategy and the full energies of our Government devoted to diplomacy, I am convinced that the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese will negotiate.

The following steps should be taken promptly:

1. All the bombing of North Vietnam should be stopped, not just because the Communists want it stopped, but because strategic bombing of the North is counterproductive. In a bombing termination, strategy and morality coincide. It should be undertaken immediately.



2. Extraordinary and energetic measures should be taken by our Government to enter into negotiations with the N.L.F. and Hanoi governments. We have contacted these governments in the past. These contacts should be reopened. Negotiations should be handled by a specially appointed cabinet-level official, operating with the full confidence of the President.

3. We should develop and put into operation a plan for the de-escalation of our forces, to be based on the enclave strategy outlined earlier.

Although I think that by now the American people realize that we are on an unwise course, I anticipate bitter criticism of any plan that involves a United States phase-out from Vietnam. Harsh words will come from congressional leaders who have advocated increased bombing. Some in veterans' organizations and the military will find it difficult to accept what appears to them to be not "victory" but "appeasement." And the far left will decry as "imperialism" any safeguards necessary for ourselves and our South Vietnamese friends.

A settlement will be emotionally difficult, taxing in time, wearing on our wisdom and patience. But a settlement is imperative in our own self-interest. Its alternative is continued escalation until we oppose the forces of Red China in World War III.

With Vietnam we have grown up into tragedy. We cannot end our involvement without some cost, some pain. A mature nation can face such realities and take actions that, while they are less than some want, nevertheless lead away from the risk of self-destruction. I am sure we can.

#### "PUEBLO" CREW KIN DENY SPY CHARGE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I noted a very interesting news story, entitled "Pueblo Crew Kin Deny Spy Charge," which was carried in the Baltimore Sun of February 25, 1968. I might say that I had some remarks to make on the *Pueblo* under date of January 29, which I would like to read at this time.

In that statement I said:

In the meantime, however, the substance of our national interest ought not to be lost sight of in hot pursuit of its shadow. The problem of safeguarding the interests of this Nation, and in a very real sense, the world's interests is to see to it that the 83 Americans—which I now learn is the accurate number—are returned alive, I repeat, the word is "alive," and that there is avoided, at the same time, another bloodbath in the model of Vietnam which, in Korea, could so much more readily become world war III.

Whatever it takes to bring about that result in full—not half of it but all of it—is to be welcomed. It may be helpful to bear in mind in this connection that the responses in the Barbary Wars, a century and a half away, are not necessarily the answers for a time and place when nuclear war is only seconds away.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story from the Baltimore Sun be incorporated at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"PUEBLO" CREW KIN DENY SPY CHARGE—RELATIVES SENSED MYSTERY, BUT KNEW LITTLE OF DUTIES

NEW YORK, February 24.—Relatives of several United States Navy men on the captured intelligence ship *Pueblo* said today they had sensed some kind of mystery about the vessel's activities. All, however, rejected the idea

that the crew members should be treated as spies under international law.

Allen W. Dulles, former head of the Central Intelligence Agency, said in a television interview this week the United States should refrain from the use of force in its attempts to retrieve the crew.

He declared: "I don't think the agent who is sent in expects any military power to follow him up if he gets into difficulty."

#### KIN LARGELY UNAWARE

The North Koreans have held the ship and its crew since January 23.

Mrs. Wallace Anderson, sister-in-law of Wayne D. Anderson, of Waycross, Ga., a communications technician, said: "In a way we heard there might be some secret stuff about his job but he wasn't a talkative boy and never said anything about it."

But Mrs. Anderson said the crewman's kin "just considered he was in the Navy."

Mrs. Charles Crandell, Sr., of Kansas City, said her son Charles, Jr., a radioman, had told his parents nothing of his duties but that they had no reason to think of him as a spy.

#### MILITARY MOVE OPPOSED

Charles M. Kisler, of St. Louis, father of communications technician Earl Kisler, said he knew his son had to obtain a security clearance before joining the ship.

"I don't feel they were spies as Dulles implied," said Kisler. "They might have been pinpointing locations of shore installations through radio transmissions, but that seems an entirely different matter."

"I feel going into North Korea with armed forces would be entirely the wrong approach. You might only be signing their death warrants."

#### "OCEANOGRAPHIC" MISSION

Gerald Nolte, of Washington, Iowa, is the father of another of the prisoners, Clifford Nolte, an electronics technician. He said his son had described the *Pueblo's* mission as "oceanographic—all he mentioned was that they were testing the depth of the water in various places."

"We didn't know it was an intelligence ship and we most certainly did not think of him as an agent," Nolte added.

Mrs. Monique Strano of Hartford, Conn., stepmother of Angelo Strano, a communications technician, said:

"Angelo never mentioned anything about being a spy or anything like that."

#### DEATH REPORT UNCLEAR

"Of course we knew he was doing something in electronics and that his ship was full of electronic equipment," Mrs. Strano said, "but monitoring is a long way from being a spy."

Jesse Hodges, of Creswell, Oreg., is the father of fireman Duane Hodges, the only member of the *Pueblo's* crew who was killed when the North Koreans seized the ship.

"We didn't have any idea what her mission was and we still haven't been told exactly how Duane died," Hodges said.

Mrs. Oliver Langenberg, mother of Peter Langenberg, a communications technician, said she and her husband were unaware of the nature of the *Pueblo's* assignment or their son's duties "but we did not think of him as an agent and still don't."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THOMAS C. MANN AWARDED AZTEC EAGLE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Friday, February 23, at the Mexican Embassy, the distinguished Ambassador of the United Mexican States, His Excellency, Hugo B. Margain, on behalf of the President of the United Mexican States, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, bestowed the decoration of the Aztec Eagle on the Honorable Thomas C. Mann.

Many of us are personally acquainted with Tom Mann, and recall his outstanding work and career as Ambassador to various countries, most notably Mexico. We recall him as an Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and also as an Under Secretary of State prior to his resignation from the Government.

The award of the Aztec Eagle, which is quite unusual and is the highest decoration which the Mexican Government can bestow on a foreigner, was presented to Tom Mann for a number of reasons, not the least of which was the remarkable amount of work and dedication, which he personally contributed in bringing about a settlement of the Chamizal dispute between our respective countries.

I can speak with some degree of authority on what Tom Mann has done in this respect, because I recall going to Mexico City with President Kennedy in 1963 and attending a meeting at the presidential residence, Los Pinos. At that meeting, where there was discussed primarily the Chamizal situation and also other matters affecting the relationship between our two countries, it was my privilege to be in the room and to participate in the talks taking place between President John F. Kennedy and President Adolfo Lopez Mateos.

It was a down-to-earth meeting between two men, on terms of equality, to discuss questions of mutual interest and to try to arrive at solutions to resolve mutual differences.

It was on that basis that the groundwork was finally laid for the settlement of the Chamizal issue. During that particular meeting, which lasted approximately 3 hours as I recall, Tom Mann was in attendance at all times and gave much advice and counsel in helping to bring about a settlement.

I would say also that at this meeting there was, as well as those listed, the present Mexican Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Antonio Carrillo Flores, who at that time was the Ambassador of his country to the United States, and Don Manuel Tello, who at that time was the Foreign Minister of Mexico.

Because of this and many other contributions made by Mr. Mann in bringing about a better relationship between our two countries, it was felt that he deserved this honor, and it was bestowed upon him.

I congratulate President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz for his perspicacity in giving this award to Mr. Mann.

I also state for the record how happy I am that the relations between our two countries, two neighbors, two equals, are now at the highest and most understanding level ever in the history of the two Republics. It is due in large part on our

side to men of the integrity, the caliber, and the ability of Mr. Mann, the late President John F. Kennedy, and our present President Lyndon B. Johnson, and on the Mexican side to such outstanding individuals, men of understanding, dignity, and tolerance, as Adolfo Lopez Mateos, the former President of Mexico, the present outstanding and distinguished President, His Excellency, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, the present Minister for Foreign Affairs, Antonio Carrillo Flores, and the present Ambassador of Mexico to Washington, the Honorable Hugo B. Margain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks by His Excellency, Hugo B. Margain, Ambassador of Mexico on the occasion of bestowing the Aztec Eagle decoration on the Honorable Thomas C. Mann, at the Mexican Embassy, Washington, D.C., on Friday, February 23, 1968, and also Tom Mann's remarks in response on that same occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, HUGO B. MARGAIN, AMBASSADOR OF MEXICO, ON THE OCCASION OF BESTOWING THE AZTEC EAGLE DECORATION ON THE HONORABLE THOMAS C. MANN, AT THE MEXICAN EMBASSY, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 23, 1968

Ladies and Gentlemen:

When President Johnson went to Mexico in April, 1966, to present the statue of Abraham Lincoln, President Diaz Ordaz gave a formal dinner at Los Pinos, the Presidential residence in Chapultepec to the distinguished United States Delegation. On that occasion, President Diaz Ordaz said, more or less these words among other things: "The people of Mexico will never forget the names of two United States public officials, who always tried to support the Mexican aspirations based on justice: Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield and the Honorable Ambassador Thomas C. Mann."

President Diaz Ordaz came to Washington for a State Visit during October of last year. As everybody knows, this visit was an outstanding success and a further proof of our good political relations. At the White House, in one of the most moving ceremonies: the signature of the final legal document relating to the return of El Chamizal to Mexico, I remember President Johnson, President Diaz Ordaz, Secretary Rusk and Secretary Carrillo Flores in front of an important group of officials and guests, among whom was Mr. Thomas Mann. President Diaz Ordaz, through Secretary Carrillo Flores announced (precisely in the moments in which we were to legally receive this strip of land), that the Mexican Government would bestow the Aztec Eagle decoration on Mr. Mann. In that particular moment I was near Mr. Mann, and I congratulated him and said, "Mr. Mann: Allow me to be the first friend to congratulate you with a Mexican abrazo." And now, we are very pleased to be here, at the Mexican Embassy, and it is a special honor for me to present, in the name of the Mexican Government, this decoration to Mr. Mann.

At this time, I am going to read a special message of President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz to Mr. Mann:

"MY DEAR FRIEND: The impression left in my mind by your dedicated efforts to overcome the many difficulties which had to be solved in the juridical settlement of the Chamizal problem, after the agreement in principle by Presidents Adolfo Lopez Mateos and John F. Kennedy, is unforgettable.

"I remember the continuous going and coming of the then Ambassador Mann from

our Capital city to the cities of El Paso and Washington, to convince persons, and surmount obstacles, in a situation which, I imagine, was a very difficult task, because it was your own countrymen from the State of Texas who were concerned with it.

"It is now very gratifying to be able to attest to you the appreciation of the people and of the Government of Mexico for your efforts, which contributed so greatly toward a solution of the old Chamizal problem, a solution which was finally reached, in which reason and justice shine.

"This sentiment takes form in the decoration of the Mexican Order of the Aztec Eagle that on this day, the 23rd of February, 1968, will be bestowed upon you by our Ambassador Hugo B. Margain, and it receive expression in these lines, which also convey to you and your family, my best wishes for your happiness and my affectionate and sincere greetings.

"GUSTAVO DIAZ ORDAZ."

Very briefly I am going to refer to Mr. Mann as a public servant. He studied Law at Baylor University, in Texas, and he is an expert in Inter-American political and economic affairs. He directed a major part of the United States' economic warfare effort in Latin America, during World War II. He dealt with both political and petroleum matters during his assignment to Venezuela, as Ambassador (1947-1950).

During 1953-54, he was Deputy Chief of Mission at Athens, and he then, had the opportunity to become acquainted with European economic and social problems.

In 1957 he was called upon to serve as Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs.

We all remember President Kubitschek of Brazil who in 1958 proposed "Operation Pan America" as a cure for the ills that afflicted Latin American areas, specifically economic and social issues. It was in this troubled period that Mr. Mann, as Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, made three of his most remarkable contributions to Inter-American relations.

Although the idea of an Inter-American Bank had been urged for almost sixty years by the Latin American Republics, it had been strongly opposed by the United States. Mr. Mann had the wisdom to see the advantage of, and the courage to advocate and accomplish, a change in the United States position. There is no question about that under his leadership, the framework for the Inter-American Development Bank was developed, and acceptance of the proposal within the United States Government was obtained. The Bank was established on April 8, 1959, and now has a capitalization of six billion dollars.

Latin Americans, I am sure, appreciate Mr. Mann's efforts to help stabilize the price of coffee, which is an important export commodity for fourteen of their countries. In 1958, he organized the Coffee Study Group which led to the United Nations' Negotiating Conference in 1962, and the International Coffee Agreement of August 1963.

The Alliance for Progress, as we all know, has its origin in the Act of Bogotá. Great measure of the credit in this achievement must go to Mr. Mann's efforts. According to my recollection, he returned from the meeting of the Committee of Twenty One, at Buenos Aires, in the Spring of 1959, convinced that the United States had to do far more than it was then doing, if Latin America were to achieve economic and social progress.

Mr. Mann's proposed program was accepted and outlined in President Eisenhower's speech at Newport, Rhode Island, on July 11, 1960. He proposed that the initial fund for the program be five hundred million dollars, and this was authorized by Congress before the American Republics gathered at Bogotá, in September, 1960, to draft the Act of Bogotá and give it final approval. It was with

these five hundred million dollars that the Alliance for Progress was launched in 1961.

On August 29, 1963, Mr. Mann, as United States Ambassador to the Mexican Government, after patient, persistent, negotiations signed the Chamizal Convention. He was Ambassador to Mexico during President Kennedy's unforgettable visit. President Kennedy wired Mr. Mann, after his departure from my country on July 1, 1962: "I congratulate you not only for the splendid job on this visit, but for bringing our relations with Mexico to a point where a successful visit was possible". Due to his exceptional accomplishments in Latin America as a whole, and in Mexico in particular, President Johnson, in 1963, appointed Mr. Mann not only Assistant Secretary of State, but United States Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, and Special Assistant to the President, as well. In December, 1963, President Johnson said: "We expect to speak with one voice on all matters affecting this Hemisphere. Mr. Mann, with the support of the Secretary of State and the President, will be that voice."

As a lawyer Mr. Mann has a permanent vocation: to devote his life to justice; as a public servant, he exemplifies integrity. That is why in the performance of his difficult tasks, he secured the respect and the appreciation of the Latin American people. It is an honor for me—on this occasion—in the name of President Diaz Ordaz, to present the Aztec Eagle to the Honorable Thomas C. Mann.

REMARKS BY THOMAS C. MANN, ON THE OCCASION OF RECEIVING THE AZTEC EAGLE DECORATION AT THE MEXICAN EMBASSY, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 23, 1968

Mr. Ambassador, distinguished guests and friends:

I am deeply grateful to you, Mr. Ambassador, for your hospitality and kind words and to the Government and people of Mexico on this occasion. In a very real sense, this gathering does honor to all those who worked with faith and courage to find a just solution to a boundary problem which had been a source of friction and misunderstanding between our countries since the time of Lincoln and Juarez.

Much more than a tract of land was involved. At stake was whether it is possible for neighbors to demonstrate once more that they can respect and carry out the terms of an arbitration award based on solemn treaties.

In a larger sense, the central issue was whether our two nations could find a way to resolve their differences by law instead of force. It is often said that we live today in a contract society. If this is true—and I believe it is—the ability of nations to build a peaceful world community depends, to a very considerable extent, on their willingness to resolve differences by a process of give and take, to contract terms of settlement, and to honor their contracts once they are made. This is but another way of saying what Juarez said much better a hundred years ago: "Respect for the rights of others is peace." I hope that respect, fair play and justice will always be the norm which governs relations between our two lands.

Earlier I referred to others who worked for a settlement of the Chamizal; and I used the phrase "faith and courage" because there was no lack of advice that settlement was not only impossible to achieve but imprudent and risky even to consider and discuss. It will not be possible to mention all of those who contributed to the settlement of the Chamizal boundary. It was in reality a collective effort in which many participated. But, with your indulgence, I shall mention only a few, Americans and Mexicans alike, without whom no agreement would have been possible.

Presidents Kennedy and Lopez Mateos, of



course, recognized the nature of the problem and instructed their staffs to work out the details of a solution. Without this, serious negotiations could not have been undertaken and when completed, could not have been approved.

Vice President (now President) Johnson, whose affection for and interest in the welfare of the Mexican nation is well known. His guidance, support and wise counsel in the early difficult days of the negotiations earned for him the respect and admiration of the American Embassy team. Everything that has transpired since then has added to my personal respect and friendship for this man and his lovely Lady who are bearing the awesome burdens of ultimate responsibility during difficult and perilous times for our country with cool courage, wisdom and undeviating attachment to principle.

I am, of course, not familiar with all those in Mexico who helped to make a settlement possible. But I do know that Lic. Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, first as Minister of Interior and later as President of Mexico, and Lic. Antonio Carrillo Flores, then Ambassador of Mexico in Washington and now Foreign Minister, played key roles. Moreover, their record of distinguished service to their country and to the hemisphere on so many occasions has earned for them the respect and admiration of their many loyal friends. I count myself in their number.

And, of course, Senator (then Foreign Minister) Manuel Tello and Ambassador Vicente Sanchez Gavito were the principal negotiators for Mexico. Without their tact, professional skill, dedication to principle and their discretion it is difficult to imagine how the century-old problem could have been resolved. Now that I am no longer in government perhaps it is appropriate for me to say, concerning Mr. Tello, that he not only represented his country with dignity and skill throughout his long and fruitful career but he enlightened all those who had the pleasure and the privilege of knowing him.

Governor Connally, Senators Yarborough and Tower and several distinguished leaders of the press in Texas provided leadership which was vital to an understanding of the problem in my own State.

The leaders of both parties in the Congress, Senators Mansfield and Dirksen, were, with many of their colleagues, responsible for Senate consent to the agreement reached.

The citizens, officials and representatives of El Paso, and especially my old friend, Sam Young, gave wise counsel concerning aspects of the negotiations which affected their city. Their understanding and support came early in the negotiations and sustained them.

The two Commissioners, Ing. David Herrera Jordan and Joe Friedkin, played a vital role, not only in advising their governments with extraordinary ability and common sense on policy, but in finding solutions to the myriad technical problems inherent in the negotiations.

Prominent Americans resident in Mexico City and, of course, individual Mexicans in the private sector, also encouraged and supported the negotiations from the beginning. Some of them are here tonight.

And, last but not least, Robert Sayre of the Department of State and Frank Ortiz, William Pryce and James Johnston of the Embassy staff, worked with patience, skill and dedication for many long months under the direction of our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. Mr. Ortiz, who is now posted in Lima and cannot be here tonight, was one of the principal negotiators.

This honor, then, belongs to all of my countrymen who worked quietly and discreetly to demonstrate that, when there are men of good will on both sides, solutions can be found to problems no matter how difficult and old they may be and regardless of how seemingly charged they are with prejudice and emotion.

Finally, Mr. Ambassador, I think you know that I was one of those fortunate enough to be born and reared in a place where two great cultures meet. For those Americans who early in life came into daily, intimate contact with the Mexican people and their descendants—and who learned at first hand of their loyalty to friends, their love of all that is beautiful in nature, art and music, their love of family and pride in country, their capacity for valor and sacrifice—ceremonies of this kind have a very special meaning and a very special value.

Nancy, too, has a very special place in her heart for Mexico. We both thank you and our hostess, Mrs. Margain, and we both extend to you our warmest best wishes for the Mexican nation, its government and its people.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Montana for his very fine and proper words in tribute to Ambassador Tom Mann and for the remarks he has had printed in the *RECORD* on the occasion of this great ceremony in Washington at which the actual bestowal of the Order of Aztec Eagle took place.

The Order of the Aztec Eagle bestowed upon Thomas Mann by the Government of Mexico is the highest decoration that is within the power of the Mexican Government under their law to bestow upon any foreigner. It is a very unusual and special decoration.

Tom Mann was reared along the Rio Grande on the border of Texas and Mexico. In the past, there had been friction along those borders. Some thought that a diplomat acceptable to the countries south of us could not come from that area.

Tom Mann had a notable record. His first ambassadorship was to El Salvador. He then went on to play the fine role that our majority leader has indicated, his role in the Chamizal settlement, as Ambassador to Mexico, which is his greatest achievement.

That agreement settled a dispute of over 100 years standing. It was a dispute that had been submitted to arbitration in 1909, on which occasion there was a Commission composed of one delegate appointed by the Mexican Government, one delegate appointed by our Government, and one delegate appointed by the Canadian Government. That Commission made an award. However, our Government rejected the award and refused to live up to it.

Our country's rejection of that award worsened our relations with Latin America, and particularly with Mexico. It was very difficult to negotiate anything with Mexico after our Government had rejected the award of the impartial Commission set up at that time. That Commission took five volumes of evidence, in 1909 and 1911.

Our refusal to accept the award was the most popular subject for political speeches until the time of the settlement.

The Senator from Montana has discussed how on the occasion of President Kennedy's visit to Mexico, President Adolfo Lopez Mateos and President John F. Kennedy agreed to settle the issue. President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz and Presi-

dent Johnson carried out that agreement. The issue has finally been settled.

It was my privilege to be present on last October 28 when the two Presidents raised the flags at the adjusted boundary. Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and Mrs. Gustavo Diaz Ordaz cut the ribbons and opened the new, adjusted boundary. The occasion was dedicated by the speeches of President Diaz Ordaz and President Johnson.

Thomas Mann has won these accolades. We pay him the highest honor this Government can pay him. We are honored that the Mexican Government has given him its highest honor. His was a diplomatic achievement of the highest order. He had succeeded where our country had failed.

The great floods of the 1860's had shifted the river between Juarez, Mexico, and El Paso, Tex., U.S.A.

I express my appreciation to Thomas Mann for what has been done. And I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader.

#### PROSPERITY AND PROGRESS FOR THE FARMER AND RURAL AMERICA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was glad to note a few moments ago that the President had sent his message on prosperity and progress for the farmer and rural America to Congress.

As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I want to compliment President Johnson for his forward-looking and highly realistic farm message which once again confirms the vital interest this Government has in the prosperity and welfare of the American farmer and farm family.

I was particularly pleased to note the President's request for an extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

I advise the Senate that in anticipation of this message, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has fixed the dates of April 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 10 for the holding of hearings on the extension of the Agricultural Act of 1965. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to place a copy of the letter and enclosure sent to many organizations and individuals throughout the country in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the copy of the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[Copy of letter sent to farm organizations and others]

FEBRUARY 16, 1968.

DEAR —: The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at its regular meeting on Wednesday, February 7, 1968 decided that hearings should be held this year to determine the strength and weaknesses of the farm programs now in effect for the major agricultural commodities, as well as to explore any new proposals to supplement or complement these when they expire in 1969. Hopefully, the hearings will be used as a basis for action the Senate must take in the 91st Congress, as well as to lay the groundwork for discussion among farm people, their organizations, and others of alternatives or improvements to existing legislation. We are inviting all interested persons and organizations to appear before the Committee to present their views.

It is not the intention of the Committee to hold hearings on any particular bills. Nor is it the intention that these hearings will result in legislation in 1968. Rather the hearings will be directed toward the formulation and establishment of general farm policy for 1970 and beyond. Certainly, shortcomings in the existing law must be pinpointed. Improvements, if possible, must be made. New ideas must be explored. All should be directed toward the improvement and betterment of agriculture.

Attached is a brief résumé of some expiring legislation and problems which need to be considered. This list is not all-inclusive, nor are the hearings restricted in any way.

These hearings will begin on April 3, 1968 and will continue with full opportunity for all to appear.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

Chairman.

[From the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry]

#### SOME SUBJECTS TO BE COVERED BY COMMITTEE'S FARM PROGRAM HEARINGS

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate is holding hearings beginning on April 3, 1968 with a view to developing general farm legislation in 1969 when various provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 expire. Following is a list of some of the subjects and problems on which testimony should be presented:

Applicable to all programs is the cost to the Federal Government. How can programs be changed so that they are less costly but at the same time protect farm income?

**I. Dairy**—The 1965 Act provided limited authority for Class I base plan milk marketing orders until December 31, 1969. Prior to enactment of the 1965 Act this Committee contended that there was broad authority for such plans, while the Department asserted there was no authority for them. New problems have arisen with respect to the effect of an adverse vote on a Class I base plan, pricing standards, legislative purpose, and administrative review of petitions for exemption from provisions not in accordance with law. A further potential long-run problem to the dairy industry is possible inroads into the market by products containing no butterfat but sold in competition to milk and its products.

**II. Wool**—The National Wool Act of 1954, which provides price support through payments and other operations at 62 cents per pound (adjusted to reflect changes in the parity index from the average parity index for 1958, 1959, and 1960), expires December 31, 1969. Continuing problems for wool producers are competition from synthetics and imports, as well as downward trends in production.

**III. Wheat and Feed Grains**—The law now provides for price support for corn at 65 to 90 percent of parity if the diversion program is in effect and at comparable levels for other feed grains; for a diversion program; for substitution of wheat and feed grain acreage; and for growing soybeans on feed grain acreage for price support payment purposes. Part of the price support may be in the form of payments for any feed grain subject to a diversion program. For 1970 and subsequent crops there is no specific authority for a diversion program. In the absence of such a program corn would be supported at such level, not less than 50 percent of parity or more than 90 percent of parity as would not result in increasing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. There would be no authority for payments or substitution.

The present wheat program is a voluntary one. Beginning with the 1970 crop the program would revert to a quota program, whereby the Secretary would be required to

proclaim quotas for wheat if he determined supplies would be excessive in the absence of quotas. A referendum of wheat farmers would be required to determine if they favor or oppose quotas. If quotas were approved by a two-thirds majority there would be monetary penalties for violating either quotas or diversion requirements, and loss of allotment history for exceeding allotments. At present domestic certificate wheat must be supported at parity and there is authority (not currently applicable because world market prices have not been above U.S. prices) for variable export marketing certificates. Beginning with the 1970 crop, if marketing quotas are in effect, domestic certificate wheat would be supported at 65 to 90 percent of parity, and export certificate wheat would be supported at not more than 90 percent of parity (The law needs clarification in this regard). The provision limiting the cost of domestic certificates to processors to the amount by which \$2 exceeds the loan expires with the 1969 crop. Noncertificate wheat support is determined under existing and future law after consideration of world price, feed grain support, and other factors. If quotas are not approved, wheat would be supported at 50 percent of parity.

Wheat and feed grain producers are disappointed by the sharp drop in prices in 1967 from those of a year ago. Unfortunately 1967 grain production in the U.S. coincided with a near record world wheat crop and record corn crops in competitive export nations. The season average price for wheat will be about \$1.40 per bushel—some 15 cents over the loan, but about 20 cents below last year's season average price. The corn price will average around \$1.07 per bushel—about 17 cents below last year's price.

The Department has taken several actions to stimulate markets. For 1968, the wheat allotment has been cut, and increased diversion authorized for feed grains. The Department made an early announcement that all 1967 grain placed under price support loan will be eligible for resale, both on farms and in commercial warehouses. CCC has made almost no grain sales in the past several months. Recently the Department of Agriculture announced that CCC stocks of feed grains would not be available until quantities of the 1967 crop under loan or resale totaled at least 6 million tons.

Some wheat growers feel that export certificates are needed to bolster their income. Wheat export certificates are not authorized under current legislation, unless domestic prices are less than world prices.

**IV. Cotton**—The 1965 Act conditioned price support on reducing acreage below the allotment by up to 12½ percent (as prescribed by the Secretary). Price support loans are limited to not more than 90 percent of the estimated world market price, and payments are made on cotton planted within the farm's domestic allotment, the rate being such as to provide the producer with total price support of not less than 65 percent of parity if he obtains a normal yield on his entire permitted acreage. The 1965 Act also provides for a diversion program, CCC sales for unrestricted use at prices designed to move cotton into the market, export market acreage and the sale and lease of allotments. Special provisions are made for small farms and for diversion on farms on which no acreage is planted to cotton. The one-price cotton system would terminate and export subsidies would be required.

All of the above provisions terminate with either the 1967 crop or its marketing year. Marketing quotas and acreage allotments would continue as at present and price support would be at 65 to 90 percent of parity without payments.

Longer staple upland cotton is in short supply. The carryover of cotton stapling 1½ inches and longer will be down to about 1.7 billion bales, by August 1, 1968, compared to a 5-year average of about 4.4 million bales.

Is legislation necessary to assure the Nation that farmers will produce enough of the cotton in demand by domestic and foreign mills, in order to meet competition from manmade fibers and foreign-grown cotton? What other changes in existing law should be made?

**V. Cropland Adjustment Program**—This program authorizes long term agreements to divert cropland to noncrop uses and promote soil, water, forest, wildlife and recreational resources. Authority to enter into new agreements expires December 31, 1969. No funds were provided for new contracts in 1968, but the budget requests funds for new contracts in 1969. Some questions have been raised as to the extent to which age, infirmity, and other factors creating special needs should be taken into account in administration of the program, and whether the special payments now made for permitting public access for hunting, trapping, fishing, and hiking should be extended to noncrop lands, including noncrop lands in connection with Greenspan projects. Should this program be continued?

**VI. Peanuts**—The exemption of peanuts for boiling from marketing quotas expires with the 1969 crop. Legislation providing for the transfer of peanut acreage allotments (P.L. 90-211) also expires with the 1969 crop.

**VII. Tobacco**—The authority provided by section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 for the leasing of tobacco acreage allotments expires with the 1969 crop. What additional legislation is necessary?

**VIII. Farm Bargaining Power**—In the State of the Union Message the President stated that he would recommend "programs to help farmers bargain more effectively for fair prices."

The future potential of the bargaining power concept has wide ramifications both with respect to geographic areas and commodities to which it might be applied and the considerable range of marketing practices that might be modified as a result of stronger bargaining efforts.

Because of the potential scope and importance of the bargaining concept, it is important to review thoroughly its possible accomplishments and limitations and its relation to other changes we are witnessing in agricultural production and marketing.

One important question to be considered in an overall assessment is whether or not changes in our agricultural marketing system are creating a wider role for bargaining.

A second question concerns the range of commodities for which stronger bargaining should be sought.

Third, the question of producer support and enthusiasm for self-discipline called for by successful bargaining techniques must be thoroughly examined before determining how much of the broad effort to secure income gains for agriculture is to be based on stronger bargaining authority.

Fourth, the operating feasibility of stronger bargaining programs must be carefully thought through. Can, for example, bargaining be conducted successfully on a national basis or will the diversity of conditions from region to region mean a narrower scope whether commodity wise or geographically?

**IX. Exports**—Is subsidized production in foreign countries threatening U.S. export markets? Overall, the export outlook in the years ahead raises problems. For cotton, exports are influenced by production in foreign countries, and other countries have been increasing production and exports as we endeavor to maintain a balance between supply and requirements. Fats and oils present problems. Soybean oil exports have not continued to expand and cottonseed oil exports are off sharply. For grains the foreign market is very competitive. With world wheat production at a near record level various countries are looking hard for places to sell wheat. To date we have held our share of the world wheat market; but, in the case of



feed grain, exports of other countries reached record levels last year while ours were down significantly. What must we do to regain, maintain, or increase our share of world markets?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say, however, that it is not the intention of the committee to present a bill to the Senate this year for consideration. On the contrary, the committee has decided to obtain information from the grassroots, in order to form a basis for legislation when the 91st Congress convenes early next year.

I assure the Senate that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am chairman, will be prepared, early in the 91st Congress, to present a bill pertaining to agriculture; particularly an extension or renewal of the act of 1965.

I note from the President's message that it is his desire to make this act permanent. I doubt that the committee will go along with him, for the simple reason that when the act of 1965 was placed on the statute books, it was thought that at the end of 4 years we might be able to do away with many of the Government subsidies that are now being paid to farmers. It seems that the act did not work as well as was contemplated.

It is my hope that when we take the matter up early next session, we will again put a time limit on it. I am hopeful that at the end of that time limit, the farmers will be in a position to produce what the country requires both domestically and for export, and get his price fixed in the marketplace. That really was the intention of the act of 1965.

So far as the food-for-freedom program is concerned, I wish to state to the Senate that I introduced a bill a few days ago, and we will obtain evidence on that program early next month. If all goes well, it may be possible for us to have that bill out of the way sometime during the latter part of next month.

Mr. President, a number of other suggestions have been made by the President, and it is not my purpose to go into all of them in detail. In his last recommendation the President said:

In addition, I urge the Congress to take action on two important measures pending before it:

To finance comprehensive planning for groups of rural counties. Such planning can help rural counties attract business and industry and make better use of federal programs. It can help neighboring communities pool their resources—health, education, training—to meet the common needs of their people.

As many Senators know, during the first session of the 90th Congress, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported, and the Senate enacted, a bill that would do exactly what the President requests. That bill is now in the hands of the Committee on Agriculture in the House. I am hopeful that the Committee on Agriculture of the House will see fit to call up that bill.

Today, we are having much trouble providing sufficient housing and transportation in our large cities. It is my con-

sidered judgment that, if the bill that was passed by the Senate some time ago were passed by the House and enacted into law, we could let the entire country know what certain communities have by way of resources—manpower, water, and transportation—which in time would lead many of our large manufacturers to establish smaller plants in the rural communities instead of expanding the large ones they now have in the large cities.

I am very hopeful, I repeat, that the House of Representatives will see fit to report that bill at an early date, so that it can become law, and thereby make it possible for the various communities throughout the country to let industry know what they have by way of manpower and natural resources.

The President also urged both the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture to hold hearings this session on various means of strengthening farmer bargaining power in the marketplace. I want to repeat that the Senate Committee on Agriculture intends to hold such hearings in conjunction with the farm programs hearings scheduled in April. Part VIII of the enclosure placed in the Record today discusses this aspect of the hearings.

Again I want to commend the President for his imaginative recommendations regarding new bargaining authority for the farmer and to continue working for the revitalization of rural areas. We shall study his proposals carefully and move ahead to implement them.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes to present various matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEDERALLY AFFECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during my years of service in the Senate—nearly 11 years now—I have expended a considerable share of my legislative energies to aid in developing our national commitment to education.

One national educational program that I have always worked for and voted for is that which is commonly referred to as Public Law 874. This act provides Federal assistance to those local school districts which have a sizable enrollment of children from families employed by the Federal Government. In most instances, this enrollment is due to a military base or other Federal installation located within the school district. In any event, it is an educational burden that cannot and should not be borne solely by the local district—simply, Mr. President, because in most instances those school districts do not have the economic resources to support a school to educate the children of all the Federal personnel there.

This important program aids localities all across America. Eligible school dis-

tricts depend on the money made available through its provisions, and the annual budgets of these school districts are figured with the faith and expectation that the Federal payments will be forthcoming.

Mr. President, it saddens me to observe that this year the Federal Government has not fulfilled its commitment. Across the land, federally affected school districts are caught short by cutbacks in Washington.

What has happened? Whereas Congress authorized a total entitlement of \$486,355,000 to be allocated according to the formulas of Public Law 874, Congress appropriated only \$416,200,000. This represents a \$70 million cut.

In addition, Public Law 90-218, signed on December 18, 1967, called for mandatory budget reductions of \$9 billion in Federal obligations. Unfortunately, assistance for federally affected school districts was not exempt from these reductions. Thus, the Bureau of the Budget made available only \$395,390,000 of the appropriation for this purpose. This represents an additional cut by the Bureau of the Budget of \$21 million from money appropriated by Congress for the impacted school aid program.

I am glad that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] is in the chair at this time, because he is very familiar with this program. On a number of occasions he has discussed with me this program and other matters affecting school districts. As a result of his service as Governor of his State as well as Senator, he is thoroughly familiar with the problem.

As a result of congressional cuts and Bureau of the Budget freezes, the \$486,355,000 entitlement expected by federally affected school districts was reduced nearly \$91 million to only \$395,390,000. Under subsection 5(c) of Public Law 874, this 18.8 percent cut in entitlement was prorated among eligible districts. In other words, all were reduced proportionately. These schools received the bad news in Bulletin No. 25, issued January 31, 1968, by James F. Hortin, acting director of the school assistance program in federally affected areas.

Every State has felt the shock of the cutback heralded in Bulletin No. 25. My own State of Texas was one of the hardest hit. The 1968 entitlement for Texas was \$26,066,402, but our prorated share of the cutback will leave us only \$20,904,631—over a \$5 million shortage. The impact has been immediate and devastating.

The superintendent of the Del Valley, Tex., Independent School District, which serves the educational needs of children from Bergstrom Air Force Base, describes his plight, as follows:

A cut of twenty percent of our entitlement amounts to \$51,258.00. These funds must be used in our district for the general operation of our school. Legal restrictions will not permit us to raise taxes at this time of year—neither can we legally operate at a deficit. Therefore, a cut in the appropriations under P.L. 874 places our school district in an impossible financial condition.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that under the laws of Texas a school

district cannot operate at a deficit. If they do not have the money they have to close down. In my days as a student they would close down after 6, 7, or 8 months, or whenever the money ran out. Now, however, they budget the money better; but their budgets are made in advance of the school year, and they are made with the expectation of receiving the impacted aid money which they have been promised. Legal restrictions do not permit them to raise taxes retroactively, but only in futuro.

A letter to me from the superintendent of the South San Antonio, Tex., Independent School District, which serves children from Kelly Air Force Base, carries a tone of frustration and despair:

We find ourselves with a budget based on past years experience with P.L. 874, where there rarely has been a cut. We find that we are advised *after our budget is made, our money is obligated, the teachers employed, desks bought for the children and the children are here*, that the government is going to deprive us of 20 percent of our money for those federally connected children. If we were a wealthy district, this would be no problem, however, we are not even average in wealth, we are below average.

I include these sentences as typical of those that I am receiving daily from Texas school districts. I am sure that all my colleagues have similar letters and telegrams from their constituents, for this unwise reduction of badly needed funds has smashed into school districts throughout America, and it understandably has aroused the people of every State.

It hardly seems necessary to point out, Mr. President, that the burden of this \$91 million cutback must fall ultimately on the shoulders of the schoolchildren in the districts affected. These children will have less in terms of quantity—less teachers, less facilities, less courses, and so forth. But more importantly, the quantitative cutback will necessarily result in a qualitative cutback. These children are our future, and their education is vital to the security of that future. I agree with President Franklin Roosevelt's observation:

The school is the last expenditure upon which America should be willing to compromise.

There is yet another factor that makes this reduction in educational expenditure doubly unjust. The rationale behind the reduction is that the ever-growing expense of our involvement in Southeast Asia necessitates a withdrawal from some of our domestic commitments.

Ironically, the very involvement for which we are asked to sacrifice educational moneys happens to be the cause of increased school enrollments in federally affected areas. These schools teach the children of the men serving in our Armed Forces in Vietnam. Some would cut the schools serving the children of the men who are making the greatest sacrifices in this period of military activity.

Those school districts near our military bases are today inundated with a flow of children from families called into the service due to the steady military buildup in Vietnam. Thus, there is an increase in the number of federally connected children, but there is a decrease in the amount of Federal funds to teach them. I have here four representative letters from my constituency that document the dual impact that the Vietnam involvement is having on federally affected school districts in Texas. I shall ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, this double squeeze on the education of our children is intolerable. Recent draft-call predictions and the possibility of a Reserve callup indicate that there will be no relief from the increase of federally connected children in our school districts—indeed, the problem will grow more acute the longer we are in Vietnam.

The answer, then, must be an adequate investment of money to provide for the education of these children. In short, we must fulfill our commitment by honoring our obligation to these school districts.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has introduced an amendment to H.R. 15399, the emergency supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1968. His amendment, No. 530, would restore the \$91 million that has been cut from the fiscal 1968 entitlement under Public Law 874.

I give my full endorsement to this amendment, and, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which will meet this week on this emergency, I intend to do all that I can to win passage for this most important appropriation. It is my fondest hope that all Senators will see the necessity for restoring these moneys, and that they will give amendment No. 530 their support and vote.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letters from school superintendents in Texas:

Mr. Billy Reagan, superintendent, North East Independent School District, San Antonio, Tex., dated February 15, 1968.

Mr. M. Ashly, superintendent, Del Valle Independent School District, Del Valle, Tex., dated February 9, 1968.

Mr. Joe C. Hutchinson, superintendent, South San Antonio Independent School District, San Antonio, Tex., dated February 14, 1968.

Mr. E. E. Schmidt, assistant superintendent of finance, New Braunfels Independent School District, New Braunfels, Tex., dated February 20, 1968.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH EAST INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT,

San Antonio, Tex., February 15, 1968.  
Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am delivering this letter to your office today with a serious purpose and a hope for your favorable consideration and assistance.

This trip to Washington by Messrs. Thrift, Brown, O'Connor and me, was for the sole purpose of pleading our cause to you regarding our grave concern over the present state of federal impact legislation (Public Laws 815 and 874).

You will find attached to this letter, a brief summarization of the effect that the Vietnam military buildup has had upon the schools of our particular community. This, coupled with the fact that federal impact funds have been severely reduced, will no doubt, if not rectified, bring considerable damage to an effective educational program in our district.

We are fully aware of the challenges which you face in meeting the needs of all of the citizens of this country and that you have many serious concerns other than our public schools. We do, however, want you to know that federal impact legislation (Public Laws 815 and 874) is generally considered a "bread and butter" proposition by those of us in school districts which are so much affected by students whose parents are connected with our federal programs—generally military.

Therefore, we earnestly ask your help in getting these programs funded at that level which is required if we are to meet the pressing educational demands of our school district.

We are sorry that we were not able to see you personally, but realize the great demands upon your time particularly when you are needed so much and so often back in our own state of Texas.

If you should desire added information at any time regarding this problem, please contact my office at once.

Sincerely yours,

BILLY R. REGAN,  
Superintendent of Schools.

NORTH EAST INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

FEDERAL FUND DATA (PUBLIC LAWS 815-874) FOR PAST 4 YEARS

Year	Federal connected students	Non-Federal students	Percent of Federal students of total	874 funds	District O. & M.	Percent of 874 in O. & M.
1964-65	4,971	13,763	26.53	433,591	\$5,836,000	7.42
1965-66	5,567 (increase 596)	15,026 (increase 1,263)	26.51 (decrease 0.02)	501,165	7,032,000	7.12
1966-67	6,446 (increase 879)	15,752 (increase 726)	29.03 (increase 2.52)	744,168	8,258,000	9.01
1967-68 (as of Oct. 15, 1967)	7,249 (increase 803)	16,876 (increase 1,124)	30.04 (increase 1.01)	740,000 (80 percent entitlement)	9,921,000	7.45
Total increase	2,278 students	3,113 students				

Note: Public Law 815—1 allocation (1965-66), \$227,700.



Observation #1: While there has been an increase within our district in federally connected students both in number and in percent of total, the percent of federal support is in danger of being seriously cut this year.

Observation #2: While the overall growth has been 2,278 federally connected students, only \$227,000 has been provided under Public Law 815 during this past four years. This is approximately eleven percent (11%) only, of the cost of providing facilities for these federally connected students in our district at approximately \$900 per student. It would require approximately \$2,070,000 to adequately build and equip for these impacted students. Our pending application of \$975,000 under Public Law 815 for construction of badly needed school facilities is of critical importance to this school district.

Observation #3: The full funding under Public Law 874 is a means of insuring that within this school district a high quality educational program can be offered for not only the federally connected students, but all other youth as well.

DEL VALLE  
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
Del Valle, Tex., February 9, 1968.

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,  
The U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Thank you for keeping us informed relative to developments concerning P. L. 874 funds even though the report is very discouraging. The failure on the part of the federal government to fully honor its commitments for federally connected students places this school district in an impossible financial position. On October 13, 1967, our survey of federally connected students revealed an enrollment of 830 3(a) students and 434 3(b) students, or a total of 1264 federally connected students. This was an increase of 91 3(a) students and 112 3(b) students over last April's survey; and, our census report just completed indicates an additional increase of 108 3(a) pupils for the remainder of this school year and next year.

Our P. L. 874 entitlement for 1967-68 as determined by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is \$256,291.00. Of this amount we have already received \$128,145.00. A cut of twenty per cent of our entitlement amounts to \$51,258.20. These funds must be used in our district for the general operation of our school. Legal restrictions will not permit us to raise taxes at this time of year—neither can we legally operate at a deficit. Therefore, a cut in the appropriations under P. L. 874 places our school district in an impossible financial position. Twenty per cent of 1264 students is 253 students. A minimum of eight classroom teachers is required for this number of students, plus additional administrative personnel and facilities.

I am well aware that we are at war and that expenditures in certain areas must be cut. As you know, I very much approve of our Head Start, Basic Adult Education, and NYC programs. These programs are good and effective, but they are not part of our basic education programs and they are not committed in our budget. We could stand substantial cuts in these particular programs without completely upsetting our budget and the operation of our school, but P. L. 874 funds are basic to the operation of our school, and frankly, I do not know how we will complete this school year with a loss of \$51,258.20 in revenue.

I regret the cutback for numerous reasons other than strictly financial. The failure of the federal government to fulfill its obligations to the federally connected students further reduces the confidence of the people concerned in the ability and judgment of the federal government to meet its obligations. Further reduced confidence is just what we do not need at this time.

I fully appreciate your position, but I do

feel that something can and must be done if we are to provide for our federally connected students. Hopefully, some adjustment will be made in the not too distant future that will provide the funds that will help us complete this school year.

Thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely,

M. ASHLEY,  
Superintendent.

SOUTH SAN ANTONIO  
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
San Antonio, Tex., February 14, 1968.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: May I have a minute of your time to explain a school man's view on Federal Aid to education? I could write pages on this, but I know you would not have time to read it and would already know the things I would have to say. This is the crux of the problem from my viewpoint as Superintendent of Schools at South San Antonio school district.

A great portion of the land of this school district is in Kelly Air Force Base and in Lackland Air Force Base. Presently, we are in a brush war that has brought over six hundred new students to our district this year. This is almost exclusively the results of the war. These people are federally connected—they are part of Lackland and Kelly's increase.

Public Law 874 and P. L. 815 were passed to take care of impacted areas. We find ourselves with a budget based on past years experience with P. L. 874, where there rarely has been a cut. We find that we are advised after our budget is made, our money is obligated, the teachers employed, desks bought for the children and the children are here, that the government is going to deprive us of 20 per cent of our money for these federally connected children. If we were a wealthy district, this would be no problem, however, we are not even average in wealth. We are below average. We have recently voted two million dollars of bonds and raised our taxes 30 per cent to build buildings for the children in this district. We have raised our maintenance tax for operation. We can not understand in arriving at priority how it could be justified to take 20 per cent of Public Law 874 out of the budget when many Title III programs are being financed every day and several categorical areas have been increased. Most of Title III programs are innovations that pertain to research, or pilot programs, that are necessary but are not "bread and meat" to the children. The Title III programs deal indirectly with the children in some kind of improvement, or in many cases appears to be merely an experimental project. It seems that we need the "bread and meat" before spending money for experimentation.

To cut Public Law 874 for South San Antonio, which is a small district of 7500 children, you are taking about 70-75 thousand dollars out of the budget that we need desperately for the welfare of the children that are presently in school and are attending every day. This cut in P. L. 874 is money that has already been obligated. If a cut is to come, it seems to me that it would be fair to make this cut before the budget is made.

Again, I will state that we need this money at the present time because of the Vietnamese war more than we have ever needed it before. I hope you will give this your careful consideration.

Let me say this final word that I appreciate your time and interest in our schools and the fine job you are doing for our country.

Sincerely,

JOE C. HUTCHINSON,  
Superintendent, South San Antonio Independent School District.

NEW BRAUNFELS  
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
New Braunfels, Tex., February 20, 1968.  
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: It is my understanding that a supplemental appropriation bill will be in the House of Representatives on Tuesday and in the Senate on Wednesday. I would like to encourage you to question as to why the \$20,810,000.00 additional appropriation for the impact areas is not included. May I urge you to support and request that the \$20,810,000.00 in supplemental appropriations for 1968 impact legislation be released for allocation prior to the close of the fiscal year.

Impact legislation is vital to the operation of our school. The 100% amount represents \$.10 to \$.11 on our tax rate. The present reduction of 20% in appropriation means that we are having to curtail our curriculum by about \$10,000, to \$12,000, in order to stay within the framework of our revenues for this year.

The federal impact legislation grew out of the problems arising during World War II and are more serious now because of the defense efforts in Vietnam and around the World. The recent "call up" of 30,000 reservists means more than 30,000 more in federal impact area children, most of which will be displaced through the move of their "bread winner" in meeting his defense commitment.

Instead of being less important as the appropriation indicated, this legislation as well as its full fund is important to all impact areas.

Respectfully,  
E. E. SCHMIDT,  
Assistant Superintendent of Finance.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR J. LISTER HILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I rise to express my admiration for one of the ablest and finest gentlemen ever to serve in this distinguished body, my friend Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama. Senator HILL came to Washington 45 years ago, and his unstinting efforts since then have given aid to every man, woman, and child of this Nation. His legislative record is unexcelled, both quantitatively and qualitatively. He has, moreover, established his indelible mark as a statesman of the highest order. LISTER HILL's gifts are a rare combination of wisdom, integrity, courage, and above all, of vision: a vision of a higher standard of health and happiness for every American, and a vision of America's destiny. Our debt to him may never be adequately paid.

The son of the eminent Alabama surgeon, Dr. Luther L. Hill, he was named for his father's esteemed mentor, Lord Joseph Lister. As a boy, he watched his father perform surgery in humble homes by the light of kerosene lamps—because there were no hospitals. He himself has said:

My earliest observations and experiences had to do with this matter of better medical care for rural people.

He entered the University of Alabama at the age of 16, and when he graduated with his bachelor of arts and laws degrees, the college annual wrote of him:

His greatest personal asset is his wonderful ability to make and hold friends.

It is apparent that this asset has remained intact. During his senior year at the university, he was elected to the student body presidency on a then progressive platform of equal rights for coeds. Never since has he faltered in supporting constructive and progressive causes which he considered just—even when such support was unpopular and politically inexpedient.

After receiving an additional law degree from Columbia University in 1916, he returned to Montgomery, where he practiced law and was elected president of the school board. He served his country in the Armed Forces in World War I, again returned to the practice of law until his election to the House of Representatives in 1923 at the age of 28. He served conscientiously and faithfully as a member of the House Armed Services Committee and ultimately became its chairman.

It was not until the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, however, that LISTER HILL truly began to fulfill his destiny. A man of staunch conviction, with enormous energies to make convictions realities, he then had his opportunity to use these driving energies to advantage. He was an unswerving supporter of such forward-looking measures as the Farm Credit Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and, with Senator George Norris, he was a prime force behind the Tennessee Valley Authority, which contributed so measurably to the economic improvement of the South.

In 1938, he was appointed to the Senate seat left vacant by Hugo Black's appointment to the Supreme Court. During this period, there were strong voices in Congress assuring the country that we had nothing to fear from war in Europe. Senator HILL, however, knew better the Nation's needs. He fought fearlessly and tirelessly for mobilization of our weakened military machine, urged the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, argued for the establishment of convoys to protect commercial vessels, and for repeal of the disadvantageous Neutrality Act.

During World War II, he cosponsored with Senators Ball, Burton, and Hatch a resolution calling for the United States to "join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of an international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." Commonly termed the B.H. resolution, this measure was a golden promise of a better future for the war-weary world. It was the promise of the United States to a yet-unborn United Nations.

As the war ended, LISTER HILL recognized the postwar needs of America, and, with characteristic drive, threw himself toward solutions. He introduced the measure leading to unification of the Armed Forces; he introduced the Rural Telephone Act providing a means of communication to millions of rural families; he contributed significantly to establishing a plan of voluntary health insurance for the benefit of every citizen; and, perhaps his most outstanding contribution, he cosponsored the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act of

1946, responsible for more than 9,000 health facilities which have been constructed in America, over half of them in cities of less than 5,000 population.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, he has been responsible for a staggering volume of legislation which directly and substantially contributes to this Nation's health, comfort, and education. He has been in the forefront, battling for such important causes as aid to education, extension of the minimum wage, equal rights for women, medical research, elimination of poverty, aid to older Americans, education of the mentally retarded, extension of libraries, and equal rights for the working man. His record is the finest measure of his love for every man. He has done this great work as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and that includes the Subcommittees on Health, on Education, on Labor, on Manpower, on Retraining, on Poverty, on Workers' Rights, on Veterans' Rights.

On all these things he has helped each subcommittee push this great progressive and advantageous work, advantageous to the people of this country. And now our distinguished colleague proposes to lay down these burdens. We shall miss him sorely. His gentle graciousness, his moral courage, his self-effacing modesty, and his vision of greatness have been of constant inspiration to each of us—particularly on that committee through which, President Johnson told me only last year, so much of his Great Society legislation passed. LISTER HILL has been the bulwark in these progressive goals of America. The Senate has never before and may never again see his like.

Mr. President, it was my recent pleasure to join with others in Birmingham, Ala., to pay well-deserved tribute to Senator HILL. At this appreciation dinner, sponsored by several of Alabama's outstanding health and medical organizations, there were remarks by the Honorable Albert P. Brewer, Lieutenant Governor of Alabama; the Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen, U.S. Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Honorable Douglass Cater, special assistant to President Lyndon Johnson; and myself.

I ask unanimous consent that the program for this February 13, 1968, appreciation dinner held at Birmingham, Ala., and the texts of our tributes to Senator HILL be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LEST A PROPHET BE WITHOUT HONOR."—APPRECIATION DINNER FOR SENATOR LISTER HILL

(Sponsored by the Health and Health-Related Groups and Institutions of Alabama, Parliament House, Birmingham, Alabama, Tuesday, February 13, 1968, 7:00 p.m.)

#### SENATOR LISTER HILL

"No man ever wetted clay and left it, as if there would be bricks by chance and fortune."—Plutarch

"The degree of vision that dwells in a man is a correct measure of the man."—Thomas Carlyle

#### IN APPRECIATION OF SENATOR LISTER HILL

Presiding: E. Bryce Robinson, Jr., Medical Director, Lloyd Noland Hospital, Fairfield; President, Medical Association of the State of Alabama.

Invocation: The Right Rev. Monsignor Francis J. Wade, Editor, Catholic Week, Birmingham.

Dinner.

Introduction of distinguished visitors.

In appreciation—Alabama: Hon. Albert P. Brewer, Lieutenant Governor, State of Alabama.

In appreciation—the Nation: Hon. Ralph Yarborough, Member, U. S. Senate, Texas.

In appreciation—the people: Hon. Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.; Hon. Douglass Cater, Special Assistant to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Response: Hon. Lister Hill, Member, U.S. Senate, Alabama.

Recognition of sponsoring organizations. Benediction: The Rev. James M. Lilly, Rector, St. Matthias Episcopal Church, Tuscaloosa.

#### SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS

Alabama Association of Children Under Six. Alabama Association for Mental Health. Alabama Association for Retarded Children.

Alabama Chapter, American Heart Association.

Alabama Dental Association.

Alabama Division, American Cancer Society.

Alabama Hospital Association.

Alabama Nursing Home Association.

Alabama Pharmaceutical Association.

Alabama Public Health Association.

Alabama Psychiatric Association.

Alabama Sight Conservation Association.

Alabama Society for Crippled Children & Adults.

Alabama State Department of Public Health.

Alabama State Nurses' Association.

Alabama Tuberculosis Association.

Birmingham Regional Hospital Council.

Licensed Practical Nurses Association of the State of Alabama.

Medical Association of the State of Alabama.

Medical Center, University of Alabama, Birmingham.

Rehabilitation and Crippled Children Service of the State Department of Education.

REMARKS OF LT. GOV. ALBERT BREWER ON OCCASION OF DINNER IN TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LISTER HILL, BIRMINGHAM, ALA., FEBRUARY 13, 1968

Tonight I have the privilege of representing Her Excellency, the lovely and courageous Governor of Alabama, on this occasion. My function is to try to express to our distinguished honored guest the appreciation of the people of Alabama for the multitude of contributions which he has made to the health of our people.

Probably no public servant in the history of our Nation has involved himself in legislation in such a great variety of areas as has Senator Hill. This outstanding statesman has been directly responsible for legislative achievements which directly touch the lives of every citizen of this country.

Thus while his service in public health is but a fractional part of his record of overall accomplishment on behalf of the people of our State and Nation, yet it is for his contributions in public health that he is best known, and primarily for Hill-Burton which has become synonymous with health facilities construction all over this Nation.

Statistics are sometimes boring; still there is no other way to recount his contributions to the people of Alabama except by reading the scoreboard in public health facilities construction in Alabama: 149 general hospitals (8105 total beds), 76 public health centers, 44 nursing homes (1330 total beds), 18 public health laboratories, 18 diagnostic and treatment centers, 11 rehabilitation centers, 6 mental hospitals (445 total beds), 2 schools of nursing (training 286 students annually), 2 tuberculosis sanatoria (42 total beds).



This represents a total of 326 projects with 9,922 total beds and in dollars and cents a total of \$99,600,000.00 in Hill-Burton funds in Alabama.

But the brick and mortar statistics are not nearly so meaningful as the countless thousands of men, women and children in Alabama who are alive and enjoying good health today due to the care they received at these facilities—what I am saying is simply that Senator Hill's contributions to public health must ultimately be measured in care provided for sick people rather than in the number of buildings and facilities which have been constructed.

I must also add that many of Senator Hill's efforts in the United States Senate have been aimed at bridging the gap between scientific breakthrough and clinical follow-up, a problem that has long plagued health authorities and providers, the delay between the development of new treatment techniques and the ultimate application of these to the patient.

And for those of us who have taken such great pride in the growth, expansion and development of the Medical Center in Birmingham and its increasing service to the people of Alabama, it is no secret that this development has been made possible through the judicious use of programs initiated by Senator Hill. I feel very inadequate tonight because there is so much more that might be said about him, not the least being that his legislation has been and will continue to be a model for other health legislation enacted by Congress in the future.

There is an ancient proverb which seems peculiarly applicable to this man and to this occasion: "He who has health has hope; he who has hope has everything."

Senator Hill has truly given hope to tens of thousands of Alabama citizens. It is impossible to find words to express our appreciation for the life, works and achievements of this great American—but Senator Hill on this occasion on behalf of the Governor of Alabama and a grateful people I say to you very humbly and sincerely "Thank You" and express the hope of us all that you may continue to enjoy in abundance the good health you have made possible for so many of your fellow citizens.

#### LISTER HILL: HUMANITARIAN

(Excerpts from a speech by RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, on February 13, 1968, in Birmingham, Ala., honoring Senator LISTER HILL)

Mr. Chairman, Senator Hill, Governor Brewer, Secretary Cohen, Mr. Cater, distinguished guests:

It is a great honor to have some part in this ceremony, honoring the most concerned Senator for the health of the people of America, and most successful in writing that concern into living action, ever to serve in the United States Senate.

It is a special privilege to me to be here, because I have been fortunate to serve for 10 years on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate under the Chairmanship of this courteous Alabamian. With his help, 80% of all the major bills that I have authored which have been written into law in that ten years have gone thru his Committee. Without his aid most of those, now on the law books, such as the Cold War G.I. bill to educate 5,000,000 service men, would have died.

It is a personal pleasure to me to come here to Alabama to honor Mr. Health of America, because in the more than 120 years that have elapsed since my grandfather Harvey Yarbrough led a wagon train of kin-folks from Sumpter County, Alabama, to the new State of Texas, legends of life in the Cane Brake country of the Tombigbee have lingered in our family.

I come also as a Texan with gratitude that Alabama furnished Texas William B. Travis,

Commander of the Alamo, and the Company of Shackelford's Red Rovers, organized and financed by Dr. John Shackelford, which company fell on the plains of Goliad, and other valiant volunteer heroes in our Texas Revolution of 1835-36.

No man has accomplished more for people than has the Honorable Lister Hill. Certainly no man has done more than he to shape for the American people a national commitment to their good health. As Lyndon Johnson once said to Lister Hill on the Senate floor:

"There are millions of our people who are better off today, and millions more who will be better off in the future because of the fine work that you have done on health and welfare legislation."

Son of a distinguished Alabama doctor, Senator Hill came to Congress in 1923 with a compassionate heart and a concern for the health needs of all Americans. More than forty-five years later we pay tribute to this same man, whose legislative efforts with seven Presidents have earned him the undisputed title of "Mr. Health."

Since 1955, Senator Hill has served as Chairman both of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and its Subcommittee on Health. Since 1958, I have been privileged to work under his enlightened and productive leadership—a leadership that has made his Committee the greatest instrument of human progress in our legislative history.

Of course, the greatest testament to Lister Hill is the mass of landmark health legislation that he conceived, introduced, and guided to passage [through the intricate legislative process] in his years of service to Alabama and the Nation.

The Hill-Burton Act of 1946 will always stand as a monument to its architect and builder, for it has done more to bring needed health services to the people of America than any other single piece of legislation. As of January 1, 1968, 9,157 construction and modernization projects for hospitals, nursing homes and other health facilities were completed or underway, thanks to funds provided by the Hill-Burton Act. These projects have brought 394,885 additional hospital beds to the people of America.

More importantly, many of these health facilities—ranging from general hospitals to diagnostic and treatment centers—were constructed in areas where none existed before, thus bringing the promise and hope of good health to tens of thousands who had known only despair before. Indeed, it is reported that more than half of the general hospitals built by Hill-Burton funds are located in communities of under 5,000 population. Through the efforts of this man who cares so much about health, these smaller towns are able to attract the physicians and medical care they must have, but could not hope to have, without a hospital.

The ultimate value of this commitment was described in 1966 by Dr. Edwin L. Crosby, of the American Hospital Association:

"Now after 20 years, the American people are reaping the full rewards of the program. An additional six years have been added to the average American's life because of the advancements in and the availability of health care. The Hill-Burton Act is continually expanding to bring in new programs to include treatment for more people. The ultimate benefits of Hill-Burton are not yet in sight."

In addition to the Hill-Burton Act, Senator Hill has brought needed visibility and money to such vital health concerns as Medical Research, Mental Illness and Mental Retardation, Health Education and Training, Preventive Medicine, and Aid to the Handicapped. Under his Chairmanship of the Health Subcommittee, fifty-seven major health measures have been favorably considered and signed into law, including a law to build 20 new medical schools in America, more dental schools, more nurse training

schools, more schools of veterinary medicine, a National Institute for the Deaf, new programs for the blind, and more new educational and training programs for the millions of handicapped children in America. He has spread the Vocational Rehabilitation program from Veterans to all Americans, including the almost two million injured in auto accidents each year and the additional two million injured yearly in industrial accidents.

Lister Hill's work has replaced hopelessness with hope in millions of American homes.

Nor can this be considered a final listing of this distinguished Senator's contributions. Already, he is hard at work on legislation to extend and expand the Hill-Burton program, to strengthen the Nurse Training Act of 1964, to insure Safe Drinking Water, to extend the Heart, Cancer and Stroke Amendments of 1965, and many other bills related to the health and medical needs of Americans.

Senator Hill has received countless numbers of testimonials, citations, awards, and honorary degrees, but the finest measure of this man's service, and the finest tribute that can be paid him, is that the American people are a healthier people because Alabama sent Lister Hill to the United States Senate.

Before Lister Hill's laws, the hospital doors of America opened with dollars. Of the people denied hospitalization, most were kept out by cost.

Most Americans didn't have the money to get in a hospital B.L.H., before Lister Hill. The deep pains in their bodies could be covered only by a greenback plaster. Now Hill Hospitals and Medicare and Medicaid and the coming laws will build and open hospital doors to all Americans, and the dollar sign will no longer be the symbol between good medical care and untreated agony and pain. Pain is universal; the treatment of it must be universally available. Lister Hill has done more than any other man in history to make the dream of medical help come true for all Americans.

To win all of these victories, Lister Hill has outflanked more opponents than General Joe Wheeler, and has charmed more people than Talullah Bankhead.

From the Red Hills through the Black Belt, to the Shining Sea Water, Lister Hill's name will live always in the hearts of Alabamians.

When the Chattahoochee sings its song from now on, it will be not only of the Hills of Habersham and the Valleys of Hall; it will be also of the Hospitals of Hill.

When the Stars Fell on Alabama, they left one whose luminosity will never fade; it is nova stella Lister Hill.

Next year, in the sesquicentennial of Alabama's Statehood, when the angel of her history comes to write in her golden book the names of Alabama's sons who loved their fellow man more and who have done most for her people in this first 150 years, Lister Hill's name will lead all the rest.

#### SENATOR LISTER HILL

(Statement by Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, February 13, 1968)

The American people will lose a great representative when Senator Lister Hill leaves the Senate of the United States. For 45 years, this distinguished statesman and humanitarian has crusaded for improvements in the Nation's health and welfare. The many programs he has sponsored and fought for are enhancing the lives of millions of citizens today and will serve to benefit generations yet to come. His foresight, wisdom, and courage have built enduring monumental good works. He has led the struggle against disease and needless suffering. His efforts have brought comfort to millions throughout this great land.

He was one of the youngest men to ever

come to the Congress. As he gained experience in the House of Representatives in that great fight for the TVA, he won the respect of all who knew and worked with him. When he went to the Senate in 1938, his sphere of influence widened. He has been an astute legislator and negotiator. For 30 years, he has served with distinction on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. For the past 13 years, under his Chairmanship, that Committee has become a great instrument in the advancement of health, education, and welfare of the American people. As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he has been instrumental in strengthening programs and supporting Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare and Surgeons General of the Public Health Service in their efforts to improve the health of all the American people.

The wide range of laws, programs and services for which he has been responsible almost defy enumeration. The Hill-Burton hospital construction program may be the most well-known of his accomplishments but add to this medical research, mental health, nurses' training, library services, teacher training, the National Defense Education Act. He has sponsored and helped to enact the major social reforms that we have today.

He has inspired all who have known him and worked with him in his many endeavors. He has prodded all of us to seek goals and achievements beyond our wildest dreams.

His wide range of interests and activities have gained him a truly historic record of achievements. In his long career in the Congress of the United States he has displayed deep compassion and concern for the needs of all Americans. He will be remembered as one of the great American Senators. The people of Alabama, the Nation and the world owe him an immense debt of gratitude.

EXTEMPORANEOUS REMARKS BY DOUGLASS CATER, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, AT A DINNER HONORING SENATOR LISTER HILL, BIRMINGHAM, ALA., FEBRUARY 13, 1968

It is a privilege to return to my native state to pay tribute to my lifelong friend, Senator Lister Hill. Others have spoken this evening from the perspective of his state and his nation. I would like to speak from the vantage point of one who was born only a block down the street from him in Montgomery, Alabama. I was born in August 1923. That same month he left town. He has assured me there was no connection between the two events.

Instead, he left Montgomery to commence four-and-a-half decades of service as one of the nation's most effective and farsighted legislators.

President Johnson's father often quoted to his son the maxim that any jackass can kick down a barn, but it takes a man to build one. Senator Hill has lived his life according to that wisdom. He has been a barn builder—he has been a nation builder.

During the past four years, I have served as the President's Assistant in the area of health and education. It has been my opportunity to watch my President and my Senator build the most far-reaching measures for the health and happiness of our citizens.

I have learned, watching my Senator, that good ideas make good politics; that it is possible to dream the impossible dream—and still get re-elected.

I have learned, watching my Senator, that you don't have to stay on the front page to stay effective—that frequently the best work is done quietly without self-trumpeting.

And I have learned, watching my Senator, what a void is left when a great legislator retires. Of all the sad events of recent weeks, none equals this one. It marks a land change,

a shift in the basic underpinnings of government.

On the day Senator Hill announced his decision, the President issued the following statement:

"Lister Hill has been a giant in the Congress for nearly four-and-a-half decades. He has built an enduring monument of good works, especially in the field of health. He will be sorely missed."

Tonight he has sent this message to this assemblage:

"If any one man could be called the father of our nation's health, it would be Lister Hill."

"My longtime good friend and colleague, and Alabama's distinguished Senator, he has for decades sought selflessly to improve the quality and availability of medical care. More Americans today are cured or cared for because of him. More children may expect to lead full, meaningful lives, and more parents can expect to become healthy, happy grandparents and great-grandparents because Lister Hill championed their cause—and a nation's well-being—throughout these many years."

"No tribute could be more appropriate to a great American than one from members of the health profession. It is a privilege to add my own praise to your own."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I regret very much that the extremely eloquent remarks of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in response, are not available. They were made extemporaneously and we do not have the text available.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. At this time, I certainly shall not try to say anything in extension regarding the very fine presentation which my friend from Texas has just made regarding my esteemed colleague, Mr. HILL.

The Senator has cataloged a great number of most important measures for which Senator HILL has been largely responsible. There could be others. But there is one to which I should like to call attention because it meant so much to the economy of some parts of the country—particularly the South.

I am sure that the Senator from Texas will remember the famous freight rate fight of years past when we in Congress, particularly from the South, worked day in and day out to try to get something done about it and, finally, a transportation bill went through the Senate and through the House. I was serving in the House in those days but Senator HILL, as I recall, was on the Commerce Committee of the Senate at that time and he wrote a simple amendment into the bill to the effect that the Interstate Commerce Commission should make a study of freight rate differentials and make a report to Congress.

There is a great deal more back of it. The fact is, the TVA had made a study and a very fine report was made which showed the absolute inequities of the so-called official rate whereby goods made in Massachusetts, say, could be shipped to Chicago in the Midwest at a rate much lower than goods made in Alabama could be shipped to Chicago. There was always that advantage given to the official territory as against the South.

Without going deeply into it, the upshot was that after the TVA report was

studied and received both throughout the Nation and in Congress, and then after the study made by the Interstate Commerce Commission, under the direction of that small amendment written into the transportation bill by Senator HILL, we finally got an adjustment of the freight rates and the practical abolition of that so-called official territory and official rate. Thus Senator HILL had a strong hand in the equalization of the freight rates. From that day to this, the South has been rising up the economic ladder.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Alabama for bringing up this most important matter. I recall, in my undergraduate days, in a class on economics, studying charts showing the freight rates and how the South and West were so disadvantaged because of them and were kept in economic bondage by that freight rate system which made it virtually impossible to engage in manufacturing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not mention the West, but the West shared to some extent, not to the same extent that the South did, in that solution. A strange thing, but it is a matter of record, that while we worked hard in the South for it, somehow, we were never able to get the West very much interested in it. But they were disadvantaged by the rates to some extent, although not to the same extent as the South, because we were actually in the manufacturing field in competition with the New England area.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I was not familiar with the great interest of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in that subject. In those 45 years he has made so many contributions that, of course, we could not, in a few minutes, or even hours, catalog them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator certainly is right.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE GEORGE M. RHODES, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, when the 91st Congress reconvenes next January, there will be many new faces in both the House and the Senate. There will be many old faces whom we will all miss in both bodies. There is an old hymn which I am very fond of, which begins:

O God, our help in ages past,  
Our hope for years to come.



One of the verses in that hymn reads:

Time, like an ever-rolling stream,  
Bears all its sons away;  
They fly forgotten, as a dream  
Dies at the opening day.

This morning I should like to pay my tribute to a Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania who has conscientiously and ably represented his constituents for 20 years, but who will not be with us next January, for he has determined to resign and go into well-deserved retirement. This man, whom I am proud to call my friend, is Representative GEORGE MILTON RHODES, of Reading, Pa.

Many of us are unhappy at the retirement, but recognize that after 10 terms in the Congress and 50 years of leadership in the Pennsylvania labor movement, he has earned the right to spend his remaining days in leisure.

Representative RHODES grew up in Reading and is of Pennsylvania Dutch stock. After high school, he worked as an apprentice printer, and continued his education at night. He early became active in the labor movement and served in many offices with many different unions. When he was elected to Congress in 1948 he was president of the Federated Trades Council of Reading and of the Conference of Eastern Pennsylvania Central Labor Unions.

He has also been active in civic affairs, serving on the Reading Housing Authority and on the board of directors of the Community General Hospital, the YMCA, the Berks County Red Cross, and the community chest.

During World War II he was a labor representative on the Reading area's manpower committee, rationing board, and other wartime activities.

The overwhelming concern of GEORGE RHODES during his tenure in the Congress has been the welfare of the individual citizen, and he has worked long and hard on behalf of legislation which he felt would improve living conditions for the poor and disadvantaged. He once said:

I began to understand the need for legislation to protect our citizens and their families during times of distress which come with industrial accidents, unemployment, advancing age, and other misfortunes. I became an ardent advocate of social security when opposition was most bitter and powerful.

Back in 1954, he outlined his credo for action:

I have tried since coming to Congress to examine all legislation—to look into all bills which come before us—for their probable effect upon people; that is, how they affect home life and the family; what influence they would have in preventing juvenile delinquency, or in the expanding of educational opportunities; whether they would mean better or worse homes for the families which make up our country.

GEORGE RHODES for many years has been a conscientious representative of the Pennsylvanians who sent him to Washington. His attendance record has been one of the highest in the House. After his first 4 years of service, he could still say he had personally read every first-class letter which reached his office.

He has reported to his constituents faithfully at the end of each session in Congress, believing that it was their right to know how he stood on all the major issues.

During service in Congress, GEORGE RHODES has served on four major committees: Ways and Means, Post Office and Civil Service, House Administration, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In that latter committee he gave special attention to programs which sought to find the cause and cure of crippling disease. He received the Award of Merit from the Association of Schools of Public Health for his sponsorship of the Hill-Rhodes Act of 1958.

As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, Representative RHODES helped write the bill expanding the social security program to include medical care for the aged.

I should like finally to mention the innumerable contributions GEORGE RHODES has made to the liberal cause in the House of Representatives. In 1956 he was one of a group of eight House Democrats who asked President Eisenhower to withhold school aid from public school systems defying the Supreme Court ruling against school segregation. In 1957 he was one of a small group of Congressmen signing a letter to the President urging that new attempts be made to negotiate with the Soviet Union on disarmament. In 1958 he was one of four Congressmen on an informal steering committee of House liberals seeking to bring about changes in the conservative House Rules Committee.

In 1959 he joined three other colleagues in urging the Members of the House to restore to the beleaguered Development Loan Fund some of the cuts made by the House Appropriations Committee. GEORGE RHODES was also active in the creation of the liberal-oriented Democratic study group in 1959, served as an original policy committee member for the group, and worked for his party by acting as whip and floor leader for the Pennsylvania Democratic congressional delegation.

GEORGE RHODES has been an effective Congressman. He has had deep convictions about where America ought to be going and he has acted on those convictions. Furthermore, he has always had the courage to speak out against programs and organizations he thought were detrimental to the welfare of the American people.

While doing all this, he has served his constituency well; and when the time for reapportionment arrived, and the Berks County district was considered too small, he willingly took on Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties as well as his old constituency, and served them equally well.

As he now retires from public life, he does so with the heartfelt thanks, not only of all his colleagues in the House of Representatives, but I am sure of those of us who have watched his work from various other places in Pennsylvania. He possesses the devotion and admiration of his constituents, whom he has served so well for so long.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## POPULATION GROWTH IN FLORIDA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call attention to an ably written article published in the Miami Herald of Sunday, February 25, 1968, entitled "Florida Now Is Home to 6 Million, Ranking Fourth in Population Growth."

I ask unanimous consent that that article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Feb. 25, 1968]

### FLORIDA NOW IS HOME TO 6 MILLION, RANKING FOURTH IN POPULATION GROWTH

WASHINGTON.—Florida has gained more than a million residents since the 1960 census and has passed the six-million population mark, the Census Bureau now estimates.

A just-released census report estimates Florida reached six million about July 1, 1967.

Only three states are growing faster.

In the six years after the 1960 census, the bureau estimates, Florida grew 19 per cent, behind only Nevada with 51 per cent; Arizona with 23.1 per cent; and California with 19.6 per cent. The population growth nationally averaged about nine per cent.

An analysis of Florida's growth indicates that the biggest part of it—about 37 per cent—came in the over-65 age group. Nationally, the fastest growing age group is 5-17 years.

The growth leaves Florida with one of the oldest populations in the country.

The Census Bureau estimates 12.9 per cent of the total Florida population is now over 65. This is the highest over-65 percentage of any state.

The census study indicates also that Florida has a below-average percentage of her population in the school age and pre-school categories.

Only 9.7 per cent of Florida residents are under five years old, compared to 10.1 nationally. And 24.6 per cent fall into the school-age 5-17 year slot, compared to about 26 per cent of the population nationally.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope Senators will read this article carefully, because it shows not only how the population of my State has grown so rapidly, but also how it is divided among citizens of various ages, showing, for example, that Florida has the highest percentage of its people over age 65 of any State in the Nation, as well as other interesting facts with reference to our population.

## BENEFITS FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, an article written by Jack Roberts, entitled, "Viet Vets Just Want Jobs, More Education," appeared in the Miami News under date of February 19, 1968.

I believe that the Senate will be most interested in this article, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami News, Feb. 19, 1968]  
**Viet Vets Just Want Jobs, More Education**  
 (By Jack Roberts)

The mother of a boy I've known since he was a baby came by the house last week to tell me he had been shot in Vietnam. One leg was broken by small arms fire, an arm cut up by shrapnel.

For Cindy Gaylor it was pure relief to know that her Bill, no matter how badly wounded, was now safe in an Okinawa hospital and no longer has to pilot combat troops in a helicopter.

It's this sort of personal identification with the war that grabs me. The boy next door, Paul Johnsen, has been there and back. Pete George, now a paratrooper, was with us frequently during the Christmas holidays. He was in the worst of the Vietnamese fighting and he came back looking worn and gaunt. I still think of Pete as a high schooler, but he's very much a man.

I have little patience with the doves who bleed daily in the headlines about the poor Vietnamese people being torn by war.

My only concern is for the young Americans being killed. I support my government, but if I had a vote on the matter I would cast my ballot for the U.S. to get out of Vietnam. I don't think the Vietnamese (north or south) are worth the death of one young American.

However, in checking around on young veterans returning to Miami from the war I learned that most of them staunchly support the war. They're confused and disappointed by the peace debate at home, but most of them stick to their viewpoint.

It's easy to find returning veterans. There are 495 of them at the University of Miami and 1,028 attending the various branches of the Miami-Dade Junior College system. Quite a few are enrolled in vocational courses at Lindsey Hopkins.

C. W. Boggs at the Veterans Administration tells me that the Vietnam war veterans are an uncomplaining lot. "They come in this office to find out how they can get some education," said Boggs. "They're serious, uncomplaining and seem anxious to get started in civilian life. They seem a lot younger than the World War II vets. Many bring their fathers with them."

Marshall Penton, the county's veterans service officer, said the young vets coming through his office are mostly interested in jobs and education. "Many of them don't know what they want to do and we, of course, try to steer them toward more education," said Penton. "But they aren't the least bit bitter. You won't find any draft card burner types in the lot."

Dr. Meredith Darlington, who gives evaluation tests to young veterans at the VA, gave a similar view of the returning vet and I learned while talking to him that the stream of returnees has begun in earnest.

There are approximately 1,500 veterans returning to Florida each month. Of these about 275 are Dade Countians. In one year's time there have been 572,000 Americans released from all the various services.

What's available to them? Well, they have the so-called "Cold War GI Bill," which sounds miserly compared to what the government gave me after World War II.

The government gave me all my tuition and books at the expensive school of my choice (Emory) and a \$65 a month living allowance.

Today, the returning single vet gets \$130 a month for all expenses. A youngster going to the University of Miami gets \$525 a semester. Tuition alone is \$747; books are another \$40; room and board is \$420; laundry \$45 and clothing, spending money and transportation easily come to \$400. The GI Bill pays about one-third of the freight.

It's better at the Junior College. Its estimated that a junior college student, living frugally, can get by on about \$690 a semester.

I have a terrible feeling of guilt where these young men are concerned. There's no band playing on their return, only unrest and sometimes insults—like the report in Time Magazine about the young veteran attending Harvard. His classmates called him "the resident fascist pig."

I'd like to see the veterans praised and showered with the kind of attention you can put in your wallet.

Mr. HOLLAND. I quote several pertinent paragraphs from the article:

The mother of a boy I've known since he was a baby came by the house last week to tell me he had been shot in Vietnam. One leg was broken by small arms fire, an arm cut up by shrapnel.

It's this sort of personal identification with the war that grabs me. The boy next door, Paul Johnsen, has been there and back. Pete George, now a paratrooper, was with us frequently during the Christmas holidays. He was in the worst of the Vietnamese fighting and he came back looking worn and gaunt. I still think of Pete as a high schooler, but he's very much a man.

However, in checking around on young veterans returning to Miami from the war I learned that most of them staunchly support the war. They're confused and disappointed by the peace debate at home, but most of them stick to their viewpoint.

It's easy to find returning veterans. There are 495 of them at the University of Miami and 1,028 attending the various branches of the Miami-Dade Junior College system. Quite a few are enrolled in vocational courses at Lindsey Hopkins.

C. W. Boggs at the Veterans Administration tells me that the Vietnam war veterans are an uncomplaining lot. "They come in this office to find out how they can get some education," said Boggs. "They're serious, uncomplaining and seem anxious to get started in civilian life. They seem a lot younger than the World War II vets. Many bring their fathers with them."

Marshall Penton, the county's veterans service officer, said the young vets coming through his office are mostly interested in jobs and education. "Many of them don't know what they want to do and we, of course, try to steer them toward more education," said Penton. "But they aren't the least bit bitter. You won't find any draft card burner types in the lot."

There are approximately 1,500 veterans returning to Florida each month. Of these about 275 are Dade Countians. In one year's time there have been 572,000 Americans released from all the various services.

What's available to them? Well, they have the so-called Cold War GI Bill, which sounds miserly compared to what the government gave me after World War II.

The government gave me all my tuition and books at the expensive school of my choice (Emory) and a \$65 a month living allowance.

Today, the returning single vet gets \$130 a month for all expenses. A youngster going to the University of Miami gets \$525 a semester. Tuition alone is \$747; books are another \$40; room and board is \$420; laundry \$45 and clothing, spending money and transportation easily come to \$400. The GI Bill pays about one-third of the freight.

I'd like to see the veterans praised and showered with the kind of affection you can put in your wallet.

Mr. President, the article written by Jack Roberts, I am sure, will rejuvenate the faith that all Americans have in this great Nation of ours and in its youth that

will someday supplant those now in authority.

We hear all too much of the minority—a small minority—of the youth in the so-called hippy movement, and the draft-card burners, for this is apparently what the news media believes will increase circulation. We have scant news of those who quietly accept the responsibility thrust upon them and carry out that responsibility in the most commendable, courageous, American way.

Mr. President, I, too, feel strongly, as does Mr. Roberts, that we should provide the necessary tools and incentive to our returning young veterans from the battlefields in Vietnam that will enable them to continue the pursuits of their choice that may have been chopped off as a result of the call to duty. Those now returning from the battlefields—and there will be many more in the future—should be afforded all the benefits that have been afforded those who participated in previous conflicts that this Nation has been engaged in. I shall support those measures that are presented to the Senate that will obtain these objectives.

Mr. President, in closing, let me state that I am hopeful that action will soon be taken by the other body on the measure, passed by the Senate under the leadership of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], to reorganize the Congress. This proposed reorganization contains, among other important features, a recommendation for the creation of a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the Senate. The ever-increasing responsibility toward our veterans makes this a necessity and must become a reality. Should it appear that the other body will continue to bottle up this important legislation, I recommend and suggest that the Senator from Oklahoma offer an appropriate resolution for the creation of a Veterans' Affairs Committee so that we may face up to the ever-increasing responsibilities to those who have served and defended this Nation with honor, without question, and without regard to their personal lives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### TRAVEL IN AMERICA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as you are aware, this Nation currently is greatly concerned about its imbalance in international payments.

Part of this imbalance is caused by expenditures of American tourists overseas, and this situation has prompted the President to ask Congress to impose certain taxes on Americans traveling in Europe.

In my recent visit to my home State of Washington, I found public opinion, in general, opposed to such a restriction on travel and, as I told many of my constituents, I do not feel this is a meaningful way to attack the problem of a deficit partially caused by tourist spending abroad.

Therefore, I am delighted to read the remarks of John W. Black, the Director of the U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce and a former member of my Commerce Committee staff, made in Washington last week. As many of you know, Mr. Black was recently named "National Salesman of the Year" by the



Sales and Marketing Executives International, for his outstanding job in promoting America as a travel destination for foreigners.

To me the key to travel abroad is to greatly expand our own efforts to get those from other nations to travel here. Since 1961 Mr. Black has done just that and it is his view and mine as well that this effort has only begun.

This approach is the positive way to attack the effects of American travel abroad because it does not seek to involuntarily restrict communication of ideas, cultures, and histories between peoples of the world.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be reprinted in the RECORD as an explanation of the forward-looking policy of the administration to encourage tourism in the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SELLING AMERICA AS A TRAVEL DESTINATION—  
A TALE OF MOUSE TRAPS AND MEN

(Remarks of John W. Black before the National awards dinner on sales and marketing executive, International Washington Hilton Hotel, February 21, 1968)

I face this occasion with a mixture of humility and chagrin. Humility, because if there were ever a time when the product rather than the salesman should be honored it is tonight. Chagrin, because I've never considered myself as much of a salesman—at least in the ordinary sense of the word.

As a matter of fact, as a young schoolboy out in Seattle, I tried my hand at various kinds of selling. My father, who has spent all of his life in the sales business, encouraged me. But despite a lot of good will and hard try, I could never seem to quite make the grade. My first job—hawking coupons good for a 50% discount on hair permanents—was a total loss. I couldn't even give the things away. Every politician whose campaign literature I passed out invariably lost the election. And when I tried my hand as a hardware salesman for Sears Roebuck, I was fired after six weeks on the job.

One of the problems was that I was always very insecure about my ability to actually make a sale. Dad told me not to worry and said whenever he faced this situation and walked into the office of an important prospect who was particularly hardnosed or stuffy, he'd just picture the man as standing there without his trousers on. This apparently was a great confidence-builder for Dad, but it didn't work for me at all. I kept worrying that maybe the other guy was thinking the same thing about me. In any case, I eventually tossed my blueprint for a sales career in the ash can and decided to enter Federal service instead.

But I've never lost my respect for the art of salesmanship—for the vast influence that a good salesman, backed by a sound marketing plan, can have upon the whole structure of our economy. Indeed, upon every facet of decision making in our society. This was true even in the thirties when I was selling cut-rate permanents on a downtown Seattle street corner. It is infinitely more true today.

In thirty years the advances made in perfecting the tools of salesmanship—advances in communications, packaging, and research analysis—have outdistanced even the giant strides we have taken in transportation and distribution, the other side of the marketing coin. Today, good salesmanship can unload any amount of deodorant, mouth wash and pain killer on a hygienically-sensitive public.

But I do not think it can sell anything that a customer does not want or need. This is true over the longer run at least. A bad

product is a bad product no matter how hard you try to push it. Those who disagree—who think that salesmanship is everything—show just as much naivete as Ralph Waldo Emerson did when he made his famous remark on the subject of marketing.

Emerson was unquestionably one of the greatest intellects that this country has ever produced. His essays on religious and philosophical matters are in a class of their own. He was also a better than average poet. But when it came to something as mundane and practical as how to make a sale, he was way in over his head.

Emerson, you will recall, was the gentleman who said, "If a man can make a better mousetrap than his neighbor, though he builds his house in the woods, the world will make a beaten path to his door." In other words, Emerson did not put much faith in scientific marketing principles or salesmanship at all.

Well I think Emerson was wrong. A good product is not enough—just as sound salesmanship is not enough. But, put the two together and you have a combination that can move mountains. I'd like to illustrate this by telling you a little about what I have learned about salesmanship in the past few years as head of the Government's "Visit USA" program.

Back in the fifties, before there was a national tourist office, America's travel product was very much like that "better mousetrap" Mr. Emerson talked about. It wasn't a perfect mousetrap, but it certainly was a better mousetrap. In fact, it was probably the best mousetrap around—even then. It was a great big mousetrap, beautifully designed, and capable of meeting almost any mouse-trapping need you could think of, in any season of the year. And it was priced right along with its competitors.

Now the people down in town had heard about that mousetrap out there in the woods. But most of what they had heard was wrong—and a lot of it came from people who weren't particularly friendly with the man in the woods, for reasons entirely unconnected with his mousetrap-making abilities.

Even the man's friends weren't too helpful. They'd go around bragging about what a high liver he was, and how everything in his house was terribly expensive.

And I must say the man himself didn't make the picture any brighter. Instead of sending his sales force into town with nice four-color brochures and a supply of mousetrap order books, he lined the road to his house with a bunch of people in uniforms and high, stiff collars who wouldn't let anyone pass until they'd filled out a lot of forms, had their fingerprints taken, and sworn on a stack of Bibles that they were not out to burn the man's house down or attack his teen-age daughter.

All of this assuming you could even find the road to the man's house, which was not too clearly marked and maps were awfully hard to come by.

Well, as a result of all this, half of the entire mouse-trap market thought the man's product was absolutely beyond the reach of their pocketbooks, and the other half figured it wasn't even for sale.

And so, just in case you're wondering, the world did not make a beaten path to his door. All the business was going to his neighbors.

At that point, the man suddenly came to his senses, threw his collected essays of Ralph Waldo Emerson into the trash heap, and started his sales campaign—albeit in a very modest way. How this came about is an interesting story.

When Congress first looked at how to organize a national travel promotion program—back in 1960 and 1961—and established USTS to head up this effort—there were still a lot of people who somehow felt that this was not a proper function of government. Most of them argued that this job should be left en-

tirely to the uncoordinated efforts of individual elements of private enterprise, and that the expenditure of public funds for this purpose represents an unwarranted subsidy to the travel industry.

Unfortunately this debate has not been finally resolved. The need to sell our travel product—as a single package, as an entity—and Government's responsibility for providing sales leadership through its national tourist office is not universally accepted. The ghost of Ralph Waldo Emerson still stalks about.

All of you have been reading the papers and know that as of New Year's Day this whole subject stopped being a parochial issue. You have been told that we must find a way of reducing the persistent net deficit in our nation's international travel account, as a means of protecting the stability of the American dollar as the Free World's principal medium of exchange.

The need to do this has now become so acute that our President has found it necessary to ask Americans to defer all non-essential travel outside this Hemisphere. He has proposed to Congress an unprecedented tax on overseas travel expenditures. But he has also pointed out that this is not the way to solve the problem over the long haul. He has reiterated his belief that the most satisfactory way of reducing our travel deficit is through positive measures, primarily through better salesmanship of America's travel product abroad.

A few weeks ago the President gathered together a group of leading private citizens and Federal executives to recommend ways of improving our travel sales posture. Their report was released on Monday. Among other things this Task Force, headed by Ambassador Robert McKinney, has recommended raising the authorized funding level of our own agency from \$4.7 million to \$30 million a year. This will finally put America's travel sales program in the international big leagues, where it has always belonged.

We are delighted and encouraged by the President's Task Force report—in all its aspects. But we must assure that none of its good work and important counsel has been offered in vain. We must finally persuade those who make the ultimate decisions of the need for one travel sales campaign and one marketing strategy.

I am convinced that a retreat to the days when every airline, steamship company, hotel chain and tour operator went their separate ways in attracting people to this country, while Government stood politely aloof will only prolong the need for travel taxes. All that we have learned about selling America as a tourist destination since 1961 makes the need for continuing a single "Visit USA" campaign abundantly clear.

Why do we need a unified approach to marketing the U.S. as a travel destination?

Practically every foreign country, every State in the Union, and every major American city with a travel program worthy of the name depends upon a single State or national tourist office or city convention bureau to carry out its promotional campaigns. Most of these agencies are supported by public funds; all of them enjoy at least some public support. If this system works so well for everyone else, there must be some good reason for it.

The balance of payments problem is a national problem affecting all of us. It was not created by the private travel industry. And there are other reasons, aside from protecting the dollar, why it is in our national interest to encourage more foreign travel to this country. Surely Government bears some responsibility, including a financial responsibility, for securing these interests.

The plain fact that a very modest beginning at selling this country as a package has succeeded rather well. In 1961 when we finally junked the Emersonian philosophy and inaugurated the Government/Industry

"Visit USA" program there were little more than 500 thousand overseas visitors beating a path to our door. Last year there were nearly three times that number.

Before 1961, we were building our overseas traffic at an average increase of less than 10% a year. Since 1961 the average annual gain has been nearly 20%.

Every economic and statistical study we have been able to put together shows that we enjoy a much larger share of the long haul tourist market than we had in 1961. They also show that the sharp upswing in "Visit USA" traffic since that year cannot be explained alone by higher foreign incomes, lower airline fares or any other purely economic factor. What they do show—not surprisingly—is that concerted, old-fashioned salesmanship by the "Visit USA" team has paid off.

But I would like to leave aside all of these arguments, and forget for the moment about politics, economics, Government's responsibility and the balance of payments, I would like to base the case for a national tourist office on some fundamental principles of sound salesmanship.

After all, what are we selling when we advertise the United States as a tourist destination? Is it a soft seat with wide screen movie on a trans-Atlantic airliner? Is it a clean hotel room with TV and a view on the park? Is it a nice lower berth on a vista-dome train? A sightseeing boat trip around Manhattan? A guided tour through Mammoth Cave?

Is it just a collection of all the services offered by our tourist industry? No. It's that and a lot more besides.

It's a clearance sale in Gimbels' basement. It's the trolleybus ride to cousin Minnie's in St. Paul. It's the comic section of a Sunday paper. It's knowing where to buy stamps and how to dial a phone call. It's an American drug-store or supermarket. A walk along the Embarkadero. But more than anything else, it's meeting the American people on their own home ground and finding out that we're fairly normal humans after all, and perhaps a little friendlier than most.

This is America's travel message—a message that can be convincingly uttered only by someone who speaks for the country as a whole.

I cannot agree with those who claim that the sales job of attracting visitors to the United States should be left entirely to our airline and steamship companies. After all, if you should receive an invitation to visit the home of a close friend for an evening, you're a lot more apt to accept if it comes from the friend himself and not from the Yellow Cab Co. or the local transit system.

But even this way of doing business is better than having no message at all—of treating our travel product as nothing more than a collection of various industry services, each advertised independently of the other.

Supposing our friend out there in the woods had decided to launch his sales campaign on this basis? I can see the ad copy now.

"For sale—one lovely assortment of wires, springs, hooks, cheese skewers and pieces of wood. Comfortable transportation provided to point of purchase."

No—the only way to sell a mousetrap is to sell it as a mousetrap—not as a grab bag of odds and ends. And that's the only way we'll ever sell the biggest, most exciting, friendliest travel product in the world.

## LET US REMOVE THE ROOTS OF RIOTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the trauma of last summer lingers still. The riot-torn country, hardly recovered from last year's violence, faces the unpleasant prospect of more disturbance in our

cities. Removing the rubble and rebuilding those parts of our cities which have been razed by riots is part of the task confronting us. It is a difficult and costly task, but much more difficult is the job of determining the causes of those riots and doing what is necessary to prevent their recurrence.

I am not so much concerned about developing mechanisms for quelling riots as I am about discovering the roots from which they grow and digging them out. Riot-control procedures are necessary and important; riot prevention is of vast-er greater importance.

Many of us have assumed that those who engage in rioting are the underprivileged, the downtrodden, the poor, those who are despairing and without hope, those with little education, no skills, and no jobs, disaffected and disillusioned youth, the slum dwellers. This assumption is challenged in a perceptive article entitled "Analyzing Detroit's Riot: The Causes and Responses," written by Irving J. Rubin, director of the University of Michigan's Center for Urban Studies. Mr. Rubin's article was published in the February 22 issue of the *Reporter*.

A quotation from de Tocqueville is included in the article which I think is profoundly apropos:

Only consummate statecraft can enable a king to save his throne when after a long spell of oppressive rule he sets to improving the lot of his subjects. Patiently endured so long as it seemed beyond redress, a grievance seems to appear intolerable once the possibility of removing it crosses men's minds. For the mere fact that certain abuses have been remedied draws attention to the others and they now appear more galling; people may suffer less, but their sensibility is exacerbated.

I commend this article to my fellow Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

### ANALYZING DETROIT'S RIOT: THE CAUSES AND RESPONSES

(By Irving J. Rubin)

In a few weeks, Governor Otto Kerner of Illinois, chairman of the National Commission on Civil Disorders that was created by the President last summer, will release his group's recommendations on ways to redress the grievances and relieve the tensions that blazed into the urban riots of 1967. Kerner has said that the report will be "uncomfortable" for many Americans; he has also said that the major recommendations of the report will deal with jobs, education, and housing. This is an indication that the Kerner Commission, like the earlier McCone Commission inquiry on Watts, assumes that the Negroes who participate in riots are primarily young people and dropouts, the uneducated and unskilled, the jobless, and the ill-housed.

This assumption, which has become convention, a wisdom about rioters, has been called the "riffraff" theory by Prof. Robert M. Fogelson of Columbia. He criticized the McCone Commission for taking this line in the face of evidence that the majority of Watts rioters were not teen-agers but young adults, better educated than their peers, employed, and resident in Los Angeles for at least five years. The participants in the Detroit riots of 1967 did not conform to the riffraff stereotype either. By a fortunate circumstance, detailed data on the inhabitants of the Detroit

riot areas are available. They were collected as part of a survey of the metropolitan region made by the University of Michigan Center for Urban Studies for the Detroit Regional Transportation and Land Use Study, of which I am the director. And they have been supplemented by statistics on persons arrested during the riots, gathered by the Urban Law Center of the University of Detroit and other responsible sources. The profile of the Detroit rioter that emerges from these data supports the evidence of Watts and other cities and indicates to me that solutions based primarily on improving schools, housing, and employment opportunities for urban Negroes are not responsive to the deeper needs behind the violence. They are the *comfortable* solutions, the things that our society knows how to do best, when it chooses, but they are not what the riots are all about. What is disturbing to me about the data we have collected—which has been available to both national and local bodies investigating the riots—is the absence of evidence that the message of the findings has got through.

### WHO ARE THE RIOTERS?

There are 600,000 Negroes in Detroit and some twenty-six per cent of their households have incomes below the poverty level. The majority of these poor live in the deep core of the city, which was not the scene of the riots. These are obviously the people who most need direct aid to improve their lot, but the best evidence suggests that relatively few of them took part in the violence. Who then were the rioters?

In the main riot areas, according to our survey, the median annual income of Negro households is \$6,200. This is only slightly lower than the figure for all Negro households in Detroit, \$6,400, and not far below the median white household income of \$6,800. (About a third of all Detroit Negroes, including those who are better off than most, do not live in either the poverty or the riot areas.)

A comparison of characteristics bearing on the family stability of Negroes living within the riot area with all Negroes in Detroit shows relatively little difference in most respects. The percentage of households with male heads (76.7) and of household heads who are married and living with spouse (67.1) is about the same. The proportion who own or are buying their homes is forty per cent in the riot area and forty-five per cent for Negroes in the city as a whole. (Sixty-nine per cent of whites in Detroit own or are buying their homes.) Forty-two per cent of Negroes in the riot area and forty-three per cent in the entire city have lived at their present address five years or more. Educational attainment of Negro household heads—forty-five per cent were high-school graduates or better—is higher in the riot area than throughout the city. Seventy per cent of Negro households in the riot area have autos available, compared to sixty-five per cent for all Negro households in Detroit.

Negroes living within the riot area are substantially better off in every respect than Negroes who live inside the deep core. They also are somewhat better off than the whites who live in the riot neighborhoods.

Although it seemed reasonable to assume that the characteristics of the rioters were similar to those of the riot-area residents, the picture that emerged was so at variance with the conventional assumptions that additional, more direct data on those arrested seemed to be necessary. These gradually became available from several sources, and they tended to confirm the general picture.

Detroit Police Department arrest records show that only ten per cent of the Negroes arrested were juveniles; eighteen per cent were between seventeen and nineteen years old, twenty-four per cent between twenty and twenty-four, seventeen per cent between twenty-five and twenty-nine, and thirty-one



per cent over thirty. The Urban Law Center's survey of 1,200 non-juvenile male arrestees shows that eighty-three per cent were employed, forty per cent of them by the three major auto companies and an equal percentage by other large (and mostly unionized) employers. No income data were gathered, but annual wages of \$6,000 and more can be assumed. Forty-five per cent of the male arrestees were married, and eighty per cent of them lived with their spouses. Two-thirds had no previous criminal convictions, and an additional twenty per cent had one previous conviction. Only about half as large a proportion owned or were buying their own homes as for all Negroes in Detroit—the only characteristic in which the arrestees differed significantly from the "average young Negro male."

Programs in the areas of jobs, housing, and education are, of course, vitally needed in Detroit, as elsewhere. Yet these are in danger because many politicians anticipate popular opposition to, or are themselves against, anything that might appear to "reward" the rioters. This is ironic, since such programs would actually reward the non-rioters. The overwhelming majority of the rioters had good jobs, few would be eligible for low-cost housing, and only a small proportion were of school age.

It becomes increasingly clear that the strident declarations of Negro militants and the more reasonably stated interpretations of increasing numbers of Negro moderates are accurate: the riots were an outburst of frustration over unmet demands for dignity and for economic and political power. They were a tragic, violent, but understandable declaration of manhood and an insistence that Negroes be able to participate in and to control their own destinies and community affairs.

#### HOW TO HELP?

As de Tocqueville put it long ago, "Only consummate statecraft can enable a king to save his throne when after a long spell of oppressive rule he sets to improving the lot of his subjects. Patiently endured so long as it seemed beyond redress, a grievance comes to appear intolerable once the possibility of removing it crosses men's minds. For the mere fact that certain abuses have been remedied draws attention to the others and they now appear more galling; people may suffer less, but their sensibility is exacerbated."

Last summer brought just this kind of lower-middle-class rebellion. Such rebellions can be put down temporarily with more police and guns and fire engines and tear gas, but to eliminate the tension, frustration, and hostility that underlie the violence, the nation must demonstrate to the Negro who has met his basic material needs that equality of opportunity is a fact and that we will deliver on our promises.

Certain specific actions, in addition to programs designed for large and low-income families that will provide decent jobs and training, educational improvement, and an adequate supply of housing, are needed now for the restive lower middle class:

A massive effort to sensitize white Americans to the true nature of our society as it has affected the Negro.

The enactment of open housing laws. These will probably not have a material effect on living patterns for many years, but will have an immediate symbolic value.

Raising the salaries and training standards of police.

The allocation of funds from nongovernmental sources to enable neighborhood organizations to hire experts both to plan and carry out their own programs and to evaluate and respond effectively to those of governmental agencies.

Conscious avoidance by whites in leadership positions of any actions that might be interpreted as efforts to select leaders for

the Negro community or control Negro organizations.

Changing local government where necessary to enable "the people" to exercise a more effective voice, perhaps by increasing the number of seats on "at large" city councils and providing for election of the added members from districts.

A similar direct representation on boards of education, even more closely related to the concept of self-determination.

Neighborhood centers must be provided—not associated with any poverty program—where citizen complaints about all departments and agencies of Federal, state, and city government can be heard, referred to the proper agency, and followed up.

The provision of low- or no-interest loans coupled with training and continuing counsel to enable more Negroes to become entrepreneurs.

These are a few steps—in addition to accelerated anti-poverty measures—which I believe constitute the minimum necessary. If we deal only with housing, education, and jobs, we are sowing the seeds of even greater trouble, because we will be placing more and more Negroes in a better position to realize how empty these are without dignity and a meaningful degree of control over their own destiny.

#### RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, once again, Congress has an opportunity to provide adequate funding for the unique and innovative rent supplement program.

Rent supplements are one of the crucial tools in our efforts to rebuild our inner cities. Congress has been asked to appropriate \$65 million in contract authority for the rent supplement program in fiscal 1969. These funds would provide 72,500 units. Congress should grant this authority.

Since 1965, we have made \$42 million in contract authority available to provide 42,000 units. This has been merely a token testing of the 3-year-old effort.

In the intervening months there was a lively public debate about the merits of this housing aid for poor families. Some comments have been helpful and informative. Others, unfortunately, resulted from misinformation or lack of understanding. Some were plain distortions.

Now the program is tested, in operation, and a success. Rent supplements have been found to be eminently effective in enlisting private enterprise in supplying sorely needed housing for the disadvantaged. Indeed, it is built on the concept that major involvement of the private sector brings efficiencies, economies, and progressive improvements.

Let me give a brief review of how this is done and how the program can lead to immense gains not only in the physical housing supplied, but in living conditions and morale of those now in dilapidated quarters.

Typically, a housing program is sponsored by a nonprofit organization or a limited dividend corporation. Financed in the traditional manner, the market rate mortgage loans are made by private lenders and insured by the Federal Housing Administration. The housing is privately planned and upon completion of rehabilitation or construction of a new project, will be privately owned and managed.

Rent supplement developments are subject to local taxing authority. They

are modest in design but there is no institutional or project appearance.

The private owner selects his tenants, and the usual landlord-tenant relationship exists. Occupants are low income families eligible for public housing in the area. The family pays one-fourth of its income toward rent and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, through the Federal Housing Administration, pays directly to the landlord the difference needed to make up the full economic rent.

Besides the income limitation, the program also requires that a tenant must qualify in one of five other ways. He must be either displaced by governmental action from present quarters; be 62 years old or older; be handicapped; living in substandard housing; or his present or former home must have been destroyed or extensively damaged in a disaster.

A particularly flexible feature of the program is the provision for reduction in supplements as the income of a tenant family increases. When one-fourth of the family's income meets the economic rent, the supplement is eliminated. But the tenant need not be evicted when his income exceeds the limitation. Thus, the low-income family which improves its lot is not required to move out of decent housing and back to the slums.

This feature also enables the Government to reap the benefit of having the cost of payments drop below the maximum contract level during the life of the contract.

In human terms, rent supplements hold the promise of good quarters with enough bedrooms to live decently. Unless we adequately fund the program this year, men, women and children will never know what it is like to be proud of their homes, or what sitting down to a meal together means, or what personal privacy is. Our overcrowded slums deny these opportunities.

We have long reached the conclusion that the government alone could not adequately supply the income amount of low-income housing needed in this Nation. The involvement of private enterprise is crucial to achieving this objective. In rent supplements—a private housing program—we have the means of developing the private-public partnership required to meet our goal.

We have taken only a tiny step in implementing this program. We must seize the opportunity in this session of Congress to make the rent supplements a full-fledged member in our battery of housing programs.

It is not too much to say that the overall well-being of our communities depends on this action.

I urge the full funding of the rent supplement program.

#### EFFICIENCY REPORTS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, those who have served as officers in World War II know that an officer's military career depends on his efficiency reports. They are a vital factor in his promotions. While serving with the U.S. Army in Italy during World War II, it was my misfortune to be assigned to the

command of an English colonel for 6 months. I considered him obnoxious and overbearing, particularly when he was under the influence of liquor, which was very frequently. It became evident that he filed with an American colonel or general, at headquarters in Naples, comment adverse to me as a result of which I received an efficiency rating termed "very satisfactory" which really means "very poor." That low rating was fortunately overcome by a series of high ratings either "excellent" or "superior" from American commanding officers during the following 2½ years.

Later in the course of the war, I, as an Army officer, made Army efficiency reports relating to officers of lesser rank serving in association with me, so I am familiar with this process.

Recently a few appraisals found in Pentagon files came to my attention. I should like to share these gems of wisdom with Senators. Here are some:

This officer has talents but has kept them well hidden.

A quiet, reticent, neat-appearing officer—industrious, tenacious, diffident, careful, and neat. I do not wish to have him as a member of my command at any time.

His leadership is outstanding except for his lack of ability to get along with his subordinates.

Can express a sentence in two paragraphs at any time.

Mental traits? He hasn't any.

Never makes the same mistake twice, but it seems to me he makes them all at once.

Open to suggestions but never follows them.

An independent thinker with a subaverage mentality.

He has nearly as many degrees as a Fahrenheit thermometer. Lacks common sense.

Recently married and devotes more time to his activity than to his military duties.

## THE DECLARATION OF HELSINKI

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on December 3, 1967, Dr. Christian Barnard, heart surgeon at the University of Cape-town Medical School Observatory at Capetown, South Africa, performed the first human heart transplant on Mr. Louis Washkansky. This was heralded across the world as a monumental scientific achievement and advancement in medical technology. It should not be called anything less than that. However, when the television cameras and teletype machines around the world were temporarily turned off, the true moment of reflection on the real significance of this great feat was at hand—it was time for the "critic's review" of the great drama. The assessment of the reviewers can be summed up in the general statement that the heart transplant was a tangible advancement in medical science research. On the other hand, this advancement also brought the entire world face to face with the moral, ethical, legal, and social implications of using human-beings in research. In other words, what, if any, are the social and political implications implicitly or explicitly revealed by such an operation?

Human heart transplantations and the implications I refer to have caused concern not only in the scientific and medical communities, but also in Congress. I have read a number of articles and

news stories relating to some of these significant aspects that resulted from this medical research achievement which have to be faced by the medical researcher. I have also read the stories bringing up the question of the social and political implications and the public policy issues that may be involved. But I have not seen any such publicity on what the medical profession has done in the past to prepare their profession for the inevitable questions that must be asked in making the moral, ethical, and legal decisions in the use of human-beings in clinical investigations.

This is certainly not to imply that nothing has been done. On the contrary, scientists in medical research, practicing physicians, administrators, and clinical research technicians have been wrestling with these important questions for some time. Yet they are usually tucked away in medical journals or printed in pamphlet form and circulated among members of the medical profession. The basic reason for this is that this honored profession does not seek "page 1" publicity or crave the floodlights of the television cameras. These are a dedicated group of doctors working under the Hippocratic oath of accomplishing one basic objective in life—to save human lives; and when this is not possible, to provide every technique possible to care for a patient until life has ebbed away.

Therefore, I want to invite the attention of Senators to the relatively unpublished but very significant "Declaration of Helsinki" as adopted by the World Medical Association in 1964, and subsequently adopted by the American Medical Association and other such medical associations and organizations as the American College of Physicians and the American College of Surgeons. I ask unanimous consent that the "Declaration of Helsinki" be printed in full at this point in the RECORD with a list of the medical organizations in the United States that have endorsed these principles. In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete text of the American Medical Association's ethical guidelines for clinical investigation.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### DECLARATION OF HELSINKI RECOMMENDATIONS GUIDING DOCTORS IN CLINICAL RESEARCH

#### Introduction

It is the mission of the doctor to safeguard the health of the people. His knowledge and conscience are dedicated to the fulfillment of this mission.

The Declaration of Geneva of The World Medical Association binds the doctor with the words: "The health of my patient will be my first consideration" and the International Code of Medical Ethics which declares that "Any act or advice which could weaken physical or mental resistance of a human being may be used only in his interest."

Because it is essential that the results of laboratory experiments be applied to human beings to further scientific knowledge and to help suffering humanity, The World Medical Association has prepared the following recommendations as a guide to each doctor in clinical research. It must be stressed that the standards as drafted are only a guide to

physicians all over the world. Doctors are not relieved from criminal, civil and ethical responsibilities under the laws of their own countries.

In the field of clinical research a fundamental distinction must be recognized between clinical research in which the aim is essentially therapeutic for a patient, and the clinical research, the essential object of which is purely scientific and without therapeutic value to the person subjected to the research.

#### I. Basic principles

1. Clinical research must conform to the moral and scientific principles that justify medical research and should be based on laboratory and animal experiments or other scientifically established facts.

2. Clinical research should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons and under the supervision of a qualified medical man.

3. Clinical research cannot legitimately be carried out unless the importance of the objective is in proportion to the inherent risk to the subject.

4. Every clinical research project should be preceded by careful assessment of inherent risks in comparison to foreseeable benefits to the subject or to others.

5. Special caution should be exercised by the doctor in performing clinical research in which the personality of the subject is liable to be altered by drugs or experimental procedure.

#### II. Clinical research combined with professional care

1. In the treatment of the sick person, the doctor must be free to use a new therapeutic measure, if in his judgment it offers hope of saving life, reestablishing health, or alleviating suffering.

If at all possible, consistent with patient psychology, the doctor should obtain the patient's freely given consent after the patient has been given a full explanation. In case of legal incapacity, consent should also be procured from the legal guardian; in case of physical incapacity the permission of the legal guardian replaces that of the patient.

2. The doctor can combine clinical research with professional care, the objective being the acquisition of new medical knowledge, only to the extent that clinical research is justified by its therapeutic value for the patient.

#### III. Nontherapeutic clinical research

1. In the purely scientific application of clinical research carried out on a human being, it is the duty of the doctor to remain the protector of the life and health of that person on whom clinical research is being carried out.

2. The nature, the purpose and the risk of clinical research must be explained to the subject by the doctor.

3a. Clinical research on a human being cannot be undertaken without his free consent after he has been informed; if he is legally incompetent, the consent of the legal guardian should be procured.

3b. The subject of clinical research should be in such a mental, physical and legal state as to be able to exercise fully his power of choice.

3c. Consent should, as a rule, be obtained in writing. However, the responsibility for clinical research always remains with the research worker; it never falls on the subject even after consent is obtained.

4a. The investigator must respect the right of each individual to safeguard his personal integrity, especially if the subject is in a dependent relationship to the investigator.

4b. At any time during the course of clinical research the subject or his guardian should be free to withdraw permission for research to be continued.

The investigator or the investigating team should discontinue the research if in his or



their judgment, it may, if continued, be harmful to the individual.

We, the undersigned medical organizations, endorse the ethical principles set forth in the Declaration of Helsinki by the World Medical Association concerning human experimentation. These principles supplement the principles of medical ethics to which American physicians already subscribe.

American Federation for Clinical Research.  
American Society for Clinical Investigation.

Central Society for Clinical Research.  
American College of Physicians.  
American College of Surgeons.  
Society for Pediatric Research.  
American Academy of Pediatrics.  
American Medical Association.

#### ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR THE CLINICAL INVESTIGATION

(Adopted by house of delegates, American Medical Association, November 30, 1966)

At the 1966 Annual Convention of its House of Delegates, the American Medical Association endorsed the ethical principles set forth in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki of the World Medical Association concerning human experimentation. These principles conform to and express fundamental concepts already embodied in the Principles of Medical Ethics of the American Medical Association.

The following guidelines, enlarging on these fundamental concepts, are intended to aid physicians in fulfilling their ethical responsibilities when they engage in the clinical investigation of new drugs and procedures.

1. A physician may participate in clinical investigation only to the extent that his activities are a part of a systematic program competently designed, under accepted standards of scientific research, to produce data which is scientifically valid and significant.

2. In conducting clinical investigation, the investigator should demonstrate the same concern and caution for the welfare, safety and comfort of the person involved as is required of a physician who is furnishing medical care to a patient independent of any clinical investigation.

3. In clinical investigation primarily for treatment—

A. The physician must recognize that the physician-patient relationship exists and that he is expected to exercise his professional judgment and skill in the best interest of the patient.

B. Voluntary consent must be obtained from the patient, or from his legally authorized representative if the patient lacks the capacity to consent, following: (a) disclosure that the physician intends to use an investigational drug or experimental procedure, (b) a reasonable explanation of the nature of the drug or procedure to be used, risks to be expected, and possible therapeutic benefits, (c) an offer to answer any inquiries concerning the drug or procedure, and (d) a disclosure of alternative drugs or procedures that may be available.

1. In exceptional circumstances and to the extent that disclosure of information concerning the nature of the drug or experimental procedure or risks would be expected to materially affect the health of the patient and would be detrimental to his best interests, such information may be withheld from the patient. In such circumstances such information shall be disclosed to a responsible relative or friend of the patient where possible.

2. Ordinarily, consent should be in writing, except where the physician deems it necessary to rely upon consent in other than written form because of the physical or emotional state of the patient.

3. Where emergency treatment is necessary and the patient is incapable of giving consent and no one is available who has

authority to act on his behalf, consent is assumed.

4. In clinical investigation primarily for the accumulation of scientific knowledge—

A. Adequate safeguards must be provided for the welfare, safety and comfort of the subject.

B. Consent, in writing, should be obtained from the subject, or from his legally authorized representative if the subject lacks the capacity to consent, following: (a) a disclosure of the fact that an investigational drug or procedure is to be used, (b) a reasonable explanation of the nature of the procedure to be used and risks to be expected, and (c) an offer to answer any inquiries concerning the drug or procedure.

C. Minors or mentally incompetent persons may be used as subjects only if:

1. The nature of the investigation is such that mentally competent adults would not be suitable subjects.

2. Consent, in writing, is given by a legally authorized representative of the subject under circumstances in which an informed and prudent adult would reasonably be expected to volunteer himself or his child as a subject.

D. No person may be used as a subject against his will.

#### THE GROWTH OF THE RUSSIAN NAVY: NEW POSSIBLE DANGER TO THE UNITED STATES—II

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, an article published recently, in *Time* magazine points up the "impressive striking power" of the Soviet Navy, particularly its large submarine fleet, now more than twice that of the United States. In discussing the threat of this Soviet naval strength to U.S. interest, the article warns:

Ultimately though, the Russian navy's biggest threat is a military one. Its offensive strategy not only zeroes submarine-carried nuclear missiles in on U.S. cities, but aims to isolate North America from Europe and Asia in case of war.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the article, entitled "Russia: Power Play of the Oceans," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### FORMIDABLE FLEETS

Since 1957, Russia has added to its navy virtually all of the ships that now make up its impressive striking power. It has a modern force of 19 cruisers, 170 destroyers, missile frigates and destroyer escorts, and 560 motor torpedo boats. Its 360 submarines, 55 of them nuclear, give Russia the world's largest submarine fleet, far exceeding the U.S. total of 155 subs but falling short of the U.S. fleet of 75 nuclear subs.

Moreover, unlike other naval powers, the Soviet Union uses its merchant marine and other seagoing services as important arms of the navy. Russia has the world's fastest-growing merchant fleet, which will pass the lagging U.S. merchant marine in tonnage in the early 1970s. Its high-seas fishing fleet is the world's largest and most modern; many of its 4,000 craft fish for vital information along foreign coasts as well as for the creatures of the sea. The Soviet Union also has the largest oceanographic fleet, whose 200 ships plumb the earth's waters for militarily valuable data on depths, currents, bottom topography and other information of interest to its ships and submarines. Says Admiral John McCain Jr., commander in chief of U.S. naval forces in Europe: "The Russian program to develop its seapower is more ad-

vanced and fully developed today than most people realize. It encompasses the full spectrum of the uses of the sea—in its military, economic, political and commercial connotations."

The new Soviet emphasis on seapower represents a major strategic decision. With its arsenal of 720 ICBMs more than offset by a larger U.S. deterrent, with its huge land army muscle-bound and deprived of global mobility in the middle of the great Eurasian landmass, Russia has turned to the sea to break out of its own geographic confines and attempt to wield truly global power.

Using the navy as a political as well as a military force, the Kremlin hopes that its mere presence in many places will act as a deterrent to the U.S. Moreover, the Russians want to be ready to move quickly into any areas where U.S. power and prestige may recede. They not only plan to project a more tangible Russian influence in the underdeveloped world, but also, by using their merchant fleet, to get a strong hold on the raw materials vital to Soviet—and often to American—industry. Ultimately, though, the Russian navy's biggest threat is a military one. Its offensive strategy not only zeroes submarine-carried nuclear missiles in on U.S. cities, but aims to isolate North America from Europe and Asia in case of war.

#### WALTER REUTHER SUPPORTS THE PRESIDENT'S HOUSING BILL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, yesterday the President presented his housing bill to Congress for consideration. It calls for a massive building program aimed at the goal of 6 million units for low- and moderate-income families over a 10-year period. This is, indeed, the type of commitment which is necessary to reach the goal of a "safe and decent home and suitable living environment for every American family," the goal first articulated 19 years ago in the 1949 housing bill.

To achieve this goal, we must have the support of all elements of society. I was pleased to note that Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers and president of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, was one of the first to endorse the President's program. In his statement, Mr. Reuther pledges the support of his organization for this "imaginative and innovative" piece of legislation.

This pledge of support is typical of Walter Reuther. He has been in the forefront of the Nation's leaders in developing and supporting programs to improve the quality of American life. His leadership in urban affairs is unquestionable, and his support of the bill will enhance its prospects for quick passage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reuther's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### REUTHER HAILS L. B. J. URBAN MESSAGE, PLEDGES SUPPORT

Mr. President, I congratulate you on the vision and the commitment that inspired this historic recommendation on urban affairs. The scope and magnitude of the proposals are such that they will begin to achieve the goal of the 1949 Housing Act, of providing all Americans with a suitable living environment. The priority that urban affairs must have in our national policy consideration has begun to be realized. It is

imaginative and innovative. It suggests using the public and private sectors in ways that will permit both to work together so that we can make all our communities livable.

We especially support those efforts that start to provide more housing—rental and ownership—for our low-income families. The proposed interest rate subsidy, increasing model cities funding, developing new towns based on diversity of income and race, and the long-term funding of these programs provide the tools necessary to do the job. We are especially gratified by the proposed changes in F.N.M.A. For they will make it possible to utilize efficiently union pension funds for housing. In addition, the consortium proposals enables private enterprise to place its resources behind social development and stimulate the creation of local housing consortia. The FNMA and consortium proposals permit the private sector to harness its energies in socially useful ways that will benefit the entire Nation.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 will be one of the most important pieces of legislation that the Congress has considered in recent years. Your proposals deserve full support. They should be enacted promptly. We will work hard to help pass them.

### RIO ARriba COUNTY SCORES A SIGNIFICANT FIRST

Mr. MONTROYA, Mr. President, Rio Arriba County is located in northern New Mexico. It is not huge in population, but our people there make up in imagination and drive what they may lack in numbers. Citizens of Rio Arriba are on the move, "working as a team" in the best American western tradition.

A striking instance of this progressive spirit occurred only recently, when the Rio Arriba County office of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service was singled out for a notable honor: selection as the finest in the Nation. The office's action farm programs are superior to any in the nearly 3,000 agricultural counties in our country. We in New Mexico are extremely proud of Rio Arriba's selection for this singular honor. I ask unanimous consent that an article detailing Rio Arriba ASCS's achievements be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RIO ARriba IS TOP ASCS COUNTY IN NATION

The Rio Arriba County office of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service is No. 1 in the nation.

ASCS headquarters in Washington, D.C., announced this week that Rio Arriba topped all of the nearly 3,000 agricultural counties in the United States for excellence of administration of action farm programs.

Carl A. Larson, ASCS Southwest Area Director, will come to New Mexico next week to present the Rio Arriba county office staff with a national award. The presentation will highlight an ASCS banquet Monday, February 19, at Taos, as part of a 2-day orientation meeting for farmer-elected ASCS committeemen in northern New Mexico counties.

Fred Romero is manager of the Rio Arriba county office. Clarabelle Ortiz and Ramona Jiron are program clerks. They carry on the day to day farm program administration under the supervision of the ASC county committee: Pat Martin of El Rito, chairman; Eliseo Valdez of Fairview, vice-chairman; and Tony Schmitz, Jr. of Ojito, member.

The national evaluation of the ASCS op-

eration indicates the award is given for "working as a team."

"As a result of cooperation, planning, and organization of their work, they have more than doubled farmer participation in needed soil and water conservation cost-sharing projects in the past few years," the evaluation stated.

Office Manager Romero has listed recent county accomplishments: 14 community irrigation system projects, special cost-share assistance to small acreage and low income farmers, inclusions of the Jicarilla Reservation Indians in the 4-corner special project carried on under the Agricultural Conservation Program, emergency conservation assistance to 511 low income farmers to rehabilitate farmland and irrigation ditches seriously damaged in floods caused by heavy rains last August.

To accomplish these results, the evaluation showed, county office personnel held a total of 26 community meetings within the county for the purpose of giving first hand information to farmers and ranchers regarding ASCS programs. Program information is presented in both English and Spanish. Romero attributes much of the success to this bilingual approach.

ASCS personnel also spent a total of 52 man-days in 1967 working with other governmental agencies on coordinated technical assistance planning and rural areas development projects in Rio Arriba county, Romero said.

The ASC County Committee and staff administer U.S. Department of Agriculture programs assigned to it by the Secretary of Agriculture and Congress Policy guidance and program assistance is furnished from the ASCS State office in Albuquerque.

The ASC State Committee, appointed by Secretary Orville L. Freeman, includes Paul Woofert of Socorro, Chairman; and Paul Simmons of Santa Fe; and Gilbert Gomez of Hagerman, members. Mr. William Morrow, executive director, heads up the State Office operation. Dr. Phil Leyendecker of Las Cruces, Director of Agricultural Extensions at New Mexico State University, is ex-officio and member of the State Committee.

### KNOWLEDGE, IDEALISM, AND INTEGRITY

Mr. MUNDT, Mr. President, with increasing and disturbing frequency, the various news media report speeches, made to college and university audiences, whose major design appears to be that of discouraging the confidence of our young people in their country, its institutions, and even themselves. In some cases, they assume the characteristics of tirades against the fundamental purposes of learning institutions; that of preparing the young man or the young woman to go out into the larger society with conscientious concern for his or her personal responsibility to that society.

It was, therefore, most refreshing for me to read a speech delivered by Dr. Reuben P. Jeschke, president of Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., at that institution's annual formal fall convocation on September 14, 1967. Entitled "Knowledge, Idealism, and Integrity," Dr. Jeschke's scholarly presentation is a gentle but forthright statement of what higher education should mean. It is a speech which I feel should be made at other colleges and universities across our land. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### KNOWLEDGE, IDEALISM, AND INTEGRITY ON THE COLLEGE CAMPUS

(Address presented by Dr. Reuben P. Jeschke, president of Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on the occasion of the college's annual formal fall convocation, held at the First Baptist Church, Sioux Falls, September 14, 1967)

My lengthy title reminds me of the old story about the speaker who used the letters of the word "Yale" to suggest the individual points in his address. The performance became unduly long. Later a weary listener expressed his relief that the title had not been "Massachusetts Institute of Technology."

College is not one but many things. Each plays its part as we move toward the goal of a properly educated individual. To my way of thinking knowledge, idealism and integrity are all essential ingredients. That being so, I would just as soon spell them out in my title and hope that as a result you may think and them more specifically.

What I mean to suggest is, both that each is necessary, but also that between them there must come to be in us a proper relationship or connection. We shall look at each in turn. At best that might be like picking up a gem and looking at it for its own beauty. It can exist alone. But only as jewels are combined into a setting to enhance each other can they complement each other well enough to serve in a royal crown. I believe these three belong together—everywhere for that matter—but particularly on the college campus.

Or we might call it a blend. The purveyors of certain commodities, some good and some harmful, are always claiming that they have a blend better than anyone else's. Well, I here propose for you a blend too, and I think that it is among the best in the world.

#### I. KNOWLEDGE

We start with the most obvious, knowledge, or the world of facts. There must be a great deal of knowledge around: libraries are bulging, research is being pursued with a regular frenzy, books are being written by the thousands, compilations of all sorts are being daily assembled. It is said that the freshmen bring in so much, and the seniors take out so little, that the colleges are accumulating more and more. You need knowledge, plenty of it, for whatever profession you will later enter.

As a matter of fact, we hear a good deal currently about the "explosion of knowledge." More and more facts are being discovered or made, so that at times we almost get a sense of being smothered under them. In some ways it is a necessary trend, in some respects it is unavoidable, and perhaps in still others it is the most glamorous fad homo sapiens has hit upon.

A recent comment on the subject was offered in an address on the liberal arts by James G. Rice of Stephens College. Said Mr. Rice: "Our game has caught up with us. Beginning with the birth of Christ, it is estimated that the first doubling of knowledge occurred in 1715, the second in 1900, the third in 1950, and the fourth in 1960. This means that if you left school in 1950, in 1960 you knew exactly one-half as much as you should have known."

Nothing I say here must give you the impression that there is much reason for you to be in college if you will not apply yourself diligently to learning facts. The basic and most recently approved ones are vital to you as a developing person, whatever your life's vocation may be. They are your frame of reference; they are the tools with which you operate. It goes without saying that in our kind of world the process can never stop. You simply must keep alert to new and changed facts as long as you live. Even the Bible says that we should get knowledge.

Having said this, I nevertheless also have some second thoughts. How much can and should a person learn? Take it from me, you



students, your teachers will invariably think that you should learn more than you do! Yet you can't learn everything. With so much changing, how hard should you work to remember something that may be out of date tomorrow? Naturally, this would be less true in some fields than others. The question of selectivity cannot and should not be avoided.

The great German poet Goethe, and a scientist of some stature as well, wrote over 150 years ago: "With the world moving at its present pace, more knowledge avails us nothing; by the time a man has taken note of all there is to know, he has lost his essential self."

Perhaps clues are to be seen in the fact that vast amounts of fact and information may be compressed into encyclopaedias and microfilm. If we know what we are looking for, these and other media make speedy retrieval possible. The computer has, of course, become in our day an object of near-worship. Whatever else may be said, it can be a vast storehouse of information, to be found again when and in whatever combination we choose.

A recent book by Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore carries the title *The Medium Is The Message*. It has a good deal to say about what it calls "electrical circuitry." In that context they say: "Information pours upon us, instantaneously and continuously. As soon as information is acquired, it is very rapidly replaced by still newer information. Our electrically-configured world has caused us to move from the habit of data classification to the mode of pattern recognition." (P. 63) In that invitation to larger concepts lies another clue to the digestion of facts, or at least how to keep from being buried under them.

I ask myself a related question, What is the point of learning facts anyway? It will help you get a job. But is that enough, especially when we forget so much so soon, and when so often each business wants the employee to learn its facts in its own way? Surely, learning of bits of information is not an end in itself. When in the Old Testament man is urged to get knowledge, he is charged equally to get understanding with it. Who of us has not met people that know a great deal. At the same time, they are anything but interesting, vital, wise or mature. With our inescapable acquiring of facts, which too often has the feel of a squirrel storing nuts, must abide a parallel concern for the meaning of these facts and how they fit into the whole complex of our knowledge. People must not only be aware of the individual trees; they have to have awareness of the entire woods. All I can do is to commend that larger goal to you.

In a volume released just last year by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., about the Vietnam War, and entitled *The Bitter Heritage* I found myself reading: "The only antidote to a shallow knowledge of history is a deeper knowledge, the knowledge which produces not dogmatic certitude but diagnostic skill, not clairvoyance but insight." (Page 102), (Fawcett Edition) I consider that an endorsement of what I have been trying to say.

## II. IDEALISM

Idealism is thinking in terms of things as a person believes they ought to be. That is, unless one has in mind a certain formal school of philosophy which is so named. Idealism looks to a better world, or even some utopia of a person's imagining.

We make a distinction in every day language between the practical people and the idealists. The first are those who want to be doing things without thinking a great deal about them. In most of the American environment they are the people who really count. Then the idealists are those who are not very realistic or effective in action, but they dream about all the better possibilities.

The distinction is too narrowly drawn. There is of course a difference in degree, some being inclined more one way than the other. Beyond that, however, we all are and have to be idealists. We have an idea by which we implement the fact or the thing, in itself neutral and without initiative. Such idealism does not necessarily make the world better for others, but it certainly keeps it from stagnating.

You are and you must be an idealist. You gather knowledge on this campus. To some extent you may be absorbing it for the sheer personal joy that comes from knowing. No doubt you soon move beyond that to the question of how knowledge may be best employed in your own life. That is where idealism enters and, strictly speaking, it may express itself on a number of different levels, depending upon what people consider to be valuable.

Alexander the Great had idealism of a sort. He wept when he was still a quite young man and had to conclude that no worlds were left to conquer. Napoleon was a part of the same mentality, even as he set out on that fateful march to Moscow. The man who is determined to make a million dollars could be described likewise. The trouble is that this is pretty largely on the level of self-aggrandizement, and rather far from idealism as we usually employ the word. Even Goethe, whom we quoted a while ago, felt that scientific and technological concepts if used alone to interpret the world "do nothing to nourish the innate humanity within us." Instead, they cause it to "sicken and wither."

What then, do we mean by idealism on this kind of campus? We would start with a fact that psychological and medical knowledge both find self-evident. Namely, that the life which does not just look in upon itself, but is outer-oriented, is bound to be healthier and happier. We take our knowledge, for instance, not as something over which a miser gloats in a dark corner, but as a resource with which we can have a lot of fun as we let it loose in the world. Thus we really do want to see it work effectively in various honorable diversions, such as work, community causes, finding a more exciting place for ourselves in the great world.

The self still remains rather strongly involved. We don't really abandon ourselves to the great challenges. This is rather like what Wm. H. White, Jr., says in *"The Organization Man"* about Christmas funds. He says people start them because they can't trust themselves to save money on their own initiative. They feel more secure in a kind of self-entrapment to the bank. The opposite, of course, is the person who feels his mission as a Christmas giver so impellingly that his goals of saving and use of the money are disciplined to that end.

The kind of idealism I would particularly commend to you is one which does not attach itself to all kinds of strings or reservations. It is self-giving in the spirit of Jesus Christ. He broke bread for others to eat, used water to wash the feet of his disciples, and was not beyond making some wine available for the wedding guests. So with knowledge or anything else Sioux Falls College enables you to acquire. It is honorable in itself. We trust, though, that when the total story of your life as a student is told the thought of "Culture for Service" has broken through to you as a meaningful option.

I find myself talking about this now and then because I consider it so basic to the abundant life. He that loses his life for the right things shall indeed find it. The greatest does become the least. The "spirit within the wheels" about which the prophet Ezekiel speaks determines whether in the last analysis those wheels mean anything or not. Idealism you must add to the ingredients for a meaningful life here. It should be kept elevated to reflect humanity's best experiences

and so that it can fully reflect the spirit of a Christian college.

An interesting recent play by Friedrich Durrenmatt, entitled *The Physicists*, has one of them say: "I give my services to any system, providing that system leaves me alone. I know there's a lot of talk nowadays about physicists' moral responsibilities. We suddenly find ourselves confronted with our own fears and we have a fit of morality. This is nonsense." (P. 76)

Is it? Later in the same play another and still greater scientist says: "Our knowledge has become a frightening burden. Our researches are perilous, our discoveries are lethal. For us physicists there is nothing left but to surrender to reality. It disintegrates on touching us. We have to take back our knowledge and I have taken it back." (P. 76) Actually he was unable to do that, and the direction into which it was already heading was one of destruction instead of blessing. The idealism of man can—indeed, finally must—turn it into an instrument for his self-realization as a child of God and the service of the common good.

## III. INTEGRITY

And now, what is integrity? The word comes from the Latin "integer," meaning whole. Integrity means that an individual possesses a certain inherent wholeness, an undividedness, or, as one dictionary definition puts it, "unbroken completeness." More broadly, we think of the truly upright person, one who is honest in a total sort of way. Such a person avoids sham or double-dealing. For him life is one consistent whole, related without diminution or loss of direction to the best that he knows.

Without integrity idealism becomes suspect or tarnished, however well-meant. It may either be a largely subjective thinking of what is desirable, or it bears little relationship to that world in which ideals must finally be expressed.

Knowledge is not yet integrity. It provides a service and satisfaction of its own. That goes only so far. Taken by itself it is like eating. But for most people eating is not yet living.

Even idealism, I feel, may fall below the possibilities or be an ephemeral kind of nothingness when taken by itself. It can be a life-long daydreaming. In practice people whom society regards as bad can nevertheless feel quite idealistic. They feel that, however out of step they are with everyone else, they are really the ones who know what is good for all. Idealism is the fire of life, so to speak, the zest we do need for motivation. Yet it can become a kind of prairie fire instead of the warmth to sustain us in the wintry nights of the soul.

That leaves integrity as the needed other ingredient to make a balanced configuration. Here we conclude by asking what is finally worth living for, what makes right right. Can I stand—or even respect—myself as an individual in the midst of everything else that life may shower upon me, or that I might grasp by main force?

Integrity is a very hard thing to pin down. But it is terribly important just the same. It is that ultimate of value and purpose and conduct which makes us people rather than mere animals. The prophets of the Old Testament were forever talking about it. Their emphasis was on justice between people. It is awareness of an integrity toward which we are at least striving that lets us dare see ourselves as made in the image of God.

Would a former ruthless newspaper tycoon like William Randolph Hearst possess it adequately? Many doubted it then, and I would doubt it now. W. A. Swanberg in his *Citizen Hearst* (Page 426, Bantam Edition) says "he was a riot of incongruity. He could only be described in contradictions. He was true and he was false. He was a puritan, and he was a libertine. He was democratic, and he was kingly. He was immovable, and he was fickle."

He was kindly, and he was cruel. He was great and he was contemptible."

In this vein David Riesman speaks of the "autonomous individual" who knows how he wants to live regardless of what the well-adjusted crowd does. Orwell in his *Nineteen Eighty-Four* calls "doublethink" the quandary of the people living under those mass controls. They somehow make themselves deliberately believe what they know to be false. This is stark tragedy. One wonders if in such a situation integrity is even possible.

You have not found your best self here, whether as student or as faculty member, unless your own life becomes an experience in integrity. Relate it to, fit it together with, make it the basis for, whatever you know about knowledge or idealism. You will become a whole person. A whole person cannot deny what is best in himself. He will see to it that everything else he knows or envisions becomes expressive of that best.

It is at this point that I have my difficulties in finding much good with that left-wing, society-rejecting segment of young people variously belonging to the "mods," or the "angels," or the "hippies," or to be included under what by now may be a generic term, the beatnik. They blame my generation for a messed up world. But they accept the advantages of that world readily enough while they reject it for its hypocrisies, materialisms, and disadvantages. Are they doing anything to give the next generation a better world? Even if their oral—or visual—protest means something symbolically, do they expect the oldsters and the other youth to set the world right? It smacks to me also of the artificial, of the unrealistic, the cowardly, the lazy, and even of the hypocritical. As a sociologist I can give some reasons for the phenomenon. This does not mean that for one moment I would recommend it to the youth of America as the way of integrity.

Has any young person ever entered into a perfect world? Name one time or generation. Those who made the creative impacts of their day did not sit around in self-pity or exhaust their idealism by denouncing others.

#### CONCLUSION

I have said all of this to you as individuals. I also say it to us as a college family. Response by us as persons should permeate to us as a group. Love knowledge, enjoy it, and seek it diligently. Commit yourself to the power and excitement of idealism as best you can evaluate it. But the greatest of these is integrity. With it the climax is reached. Without it the others have no foundation on which to stand.

#### BETTER DAIRY PRICES FOR FAMILY FARMERS URGED BY SENATOR NELSON

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, yesterday I urged the Secretary of Agriculture to restore the price support for manufacturing milk to 90 percent of parity or approximately \$4.27 per hundred pounds.

The current \$4 support price has proven to be inadequate for dairy farmers to meet rapidly escalating production expenses.

Milk production on family dairy farms is at its lowest level in 15 years as tens of thousands of farmers are leaving dairying every year. Last year, milk production dropped below 120 billion pounds for the first time since 1952, 5 percent less than the 1961-65 average. Wisconsin milk production was off 2 percent from the previous year.

I believe that the failure to improve dairy prices for family farmers might lead to widespread corporation dairy

farming with skyrocketing consumer prices.

There will always be a demand by our Nation's families for pure nutritious grade A milk. If family farms cannot stay in business and produce it, then corporation farms will certainly take over with consumers paying royally for dairy products.

Today's American family farm is the most efficient and effective producer of food in the world. That is the reason why American consumers pay a smaller share of their income for food than anyone else in any other country.

But our family dairy farmers need a better return on their investment of labor and capital. The Wisconsin dairy farmer producing the milk realizes a \$1 or \$1.25 an hour with a \$75,000 investment while the Chicago milkman delivering the milk earns more than \$3.50 an hour with little or no investment. Many people do not realize that the dairy farmer receives only about 9 cents per quart of milk that he produces.

The cost-price squeeze is dealing fatal blow after fatal blow to the dairy industry. Every available economic indicator supports the critical need to improve dairy prices for America's family dairy farmers.

Since the present \$4 support price was established in June 1966, farm production costs have increased 10 percent, taxes 8 percent, interest rates 10 percent, farm wages 10 percent, and farm machinery 6 percent.

#### CLAIROL, INC., GRANT TO LOW-INCOME HOUSING

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, a successful effort to help the urban poor must have the support of private industry. Without it, gains will be limited.

An industrial firm in Stamford, Conn., has demonstrated how private enterprise can get behind a local project and make it work.

The firm, Clairol, Inc., made available a \$22,000 grant to a low-income housing cooperative in Stamford called the New Hope Corp.

New Hope, a nonprofit corporation sponsored by the Faith Tabernacle Baptist Church of Stamford, will build a 90-unit apartment cooperative for low-income families.

The \$22,000 grant will be applied to the cost of the 53,000 square foot site on which the housing will be built.

The cooperative, which will be located outside the downtown renewal area in Stamford, will ultimately be financed by a \$1.6 million Federal Housing Administration mortgage.

But there could not have been a mortgage without ownership of the land and the purchase price could never have been met if no one had come up with \$22,000.

Clairol, Inc.—a Stamford-based subsidiary of Bristol-Meyers—came through for the city and for the city's poor. The company is to be commended. It has shown a deep concern for the community and a high sense of civic responsibility.

The grant itself was channeled through the Stamford Development Corporation, a nonprofit organization of in-

dustries and banks which seeks to help nonprofit groups sponsor housing for low- and middle-income families.

The Stamford Development Corporation, the Faith Tabernacle Baptist Church, city officials, and the Federal Government have in this instance proven that progress in the cities can be made if people will work together.

Stamford has set a good example of what can be achieved by cooperative community action.

#### BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION UNIONS PLEDGE ACTION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today we debate a bill that would represent another legislative step forward in the battle for equality of opportunity for all citizens. In such a setting it is appropriate for us to applaud a highly significant step in the same direction by the labor movement; namely, the pledge of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO to prevent "any possible discrimination."

This is a major development in the civil rights field, and it is a development at a key point—in opportunity for employment. Certainly it is one of the most hopeful signs that progress is indeed being made in our relations with our fellow man, and I applaud the efforts of the building trades leadership and Secretary Wirtz which produced this achievement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point the Labor Department press release announcing the accord, the letter from the Building and Construction Trades Department, President Hagerty, to Secretary Wirtz, and Secretary Wirtz' reply.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES DEPARTMENT OUTLINES PLANS TO PREVENT DISCRIMINATION

WASHINGTON.—The AFL-CIO Building and Construction Trades Department has pledged in a letter to Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz affirmative action to prevent "any possible discrimination" by its local unions.

The letter, signed by Building Trades President C. J. Haggerty, proposes to foster programs of recruitment of qualified minority group applicants for apprenticeship and programs for special attention to deficiencies of unqualified minority group applicants.

The Department will also: Endorse and support programs such as Outreach and Leap.

Counsel and urge affiliates to consider appropriate means of recruiting suitable minority candidates.

Recommend that local unions disseminate information about their apprenticeship program qualifications to sources of potential minority candidates within the community.

Point out to local unions the need for satisfactory minority participation.

Recommend that local unions and joint apprenticeship programs explore mutual problems with appropriate organizations representing community minority groups.

These proposals are means of implementing action taken at 54th Convention of the Building and Construction Trades Department to endorse affirmative action to prevent discrimination.



In a return letter to Mr. Haggerty, Secretary Wirtz said when these proposals are carried out they will "represent a strong and progressive forward step toward answering, once and for all, complaints that building trades unions may not be exerting their best efforts, in full support of private and public action to eliminate discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin." Copies of Mr. Haggerty's and Secretary Wirtz' letters are attached.

FEBRUARY 1, 1968.

HON. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,  
Secretary of Labor,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The building and Construction Trades Department, desiring to implement the action taken by its 54th Convention which endorsed affirmative action generally and in principle for the purpose of preventing any possible discrimination in the operation of local unions chartered by its affiliated International Unions, proposes to undertake, both directly and through the individual General Presidents, subscribing hereto, the following:

(1) To foster, with the cooperation of appropriate management organizations:

(a) Programs of recruitment of qualified applicants for apprenticeship from the Negro population and other minority groups, and

(b) Programs for special attention to deficiencies affecting the full qualification of Negro and other minority group applicants, if such exist, and remedy the same if practical;

(2) To endorse and support projects such as Outreach and Leap in those 48 cities where such projects have been undertaken and in other cities where such projects are started in the future, urging local unions to give full cooperation, not only by disseminating information concerning the apprenticeship program to those who operate the project, but also by working actively with the project so that it may be better able to recruit applicants specifically according to the needs and requirements of the apprenticeship program;

(3) To counsel and urge its affiliates to consider appropriate means whereby suitable minority candidates may be recruited;

(4) To recommend that apprenticeship programs, sponsored or co-sponsored by its local unions, disseminate full information concerning program entrance and necessary qualifications, not only to the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, but also to one or more sources of potential minority candidates within the community;

(5) To urge upon all affiliate local unions the social and economic necessity of striving for satisfactory minority participation;

To recommend that affiliate local unions and joint apprenticeship committees explore mutual problems with appropriate organizations directly representative of minority groups within the community.

Each segment of the industry will adapt and adopt this proposal according to its structure and requirements with full recognition of the joint characteristics of the apprenticeship program. There will be maximum utilization of responsible civil rights organizations willing to join in a cooperative effort to effect this proposal with full recognition of the necessity for industry to formulate its requirements for employment and entry in the trade.

We offer this form of public-private cooperation as a means of recognizing and meeting social responsibilities in full and voluntary support of government efforts to eliminate, once and for all, discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin, with the endorsement of the Department's Executive Council.

Sincerely yours,  
C. J. HAGGERTY,  
President.

MR. C. J. HAGGERTY,  
President, Building and Construction Trades  
Department, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT HAGGERTY: I am gratified to receive your letter of February 1, 1968 in behalf of the Building and Construction Trades Department and subscribing General Presidents. In your letter, you express in detail an affirmative action program to eliminate any discrimination in apprenticeship programs, thereby proposing to implement action taken by your 54th Convention.

When these proposals are carried out, they will, in my opinion, represent a strong and progressive forward step toward answering once and for all, complaints that building trades unions may not be exerting their best efforts in full support of private and public action to eliminate discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin.

This action of yours is entirely in accordance with my remarks to you at your convention, and I welcome your complete expression of cooperation with the thought that best possible solutions may lie in voluntarism by the unions themselves, in cooperation with appropriate management organizations. This is, indeed, recognizing and meeting social responsibilities in support of government efforts under law. You are to be commended for the forthright position you have taken.

Meanwhile, in the light of these assurances and in furtherance of my responsibilities under Executive Order 11246 and the Fitzgerald Act, P.L. 75-308 (August 16, 1937), I propose to continue carrying out anti-discrimination provisions concerning apprenticeship, contained in 29 CFR 30, without change or amendment, through the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, in accordance with present regulations. Any conflict between governmental action under these regulations and the activities of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance shall be called to the attention of the Under Secretary of Labor for satisfactory resolution.

Sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,  
Secretary of Labor.

#### SENATOR MANSFIELD HONORED IN UTAH

MR. BENNETT. Mr. President, tomorrow in Utah a very fitting tribute is being paid to Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD.

Senator MANSFIELD is the winner of the first Senator Arthur V. Watkins Distinguished Congressional Service Award. It is my understanding that our colleague from Montana plans to be in attendance at a banquet in his honor in Salt Lake City to accept his award, sponsored by the Hinckley Institute of Politics at the University of Utah. The event coincides with the university's annual founder's day celebration.

The award, of course, is a symbol of the esteem held by the people of Utah not only for our majority leader, but also for the man for whom the honor is named—former Utah Senator Arthur Watkins, who is scheduled to introduce Senator MANSFIELD at the ceremonies.

Senator Watkins is best remembered nationally for the prominent role he played during the stormy days of the McCarthy era. In Utah we remember him both for his national leadership as well as for his accomplishments on behalf of the State. The most important, perhaps, being his contribution to the passage of the Upper Colorado River storage project.

Like Senator MANSFIELD, Utah's venerable former Republican Senator has served long and well as a public servant in our Nation's high offices. Senator Watkins was old enough to retire upon leaving the Senate in 1952. Instead, he took a job as consultant to the Secretary of the Interior and then became chief commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission. Last year, at the age of 80, he decided to relinquish public office.

The first recipient of the award which bears Senator Watkins' name has also logged many years of honorable service to his native Montana and to all citizens of the United States through his courageous work in the Congress.

Although personally I have often found myself on the opposite side of a given issue in the Senate, I have rarely failed to be impressed with the cogency and honesty Senator MANSFIELD has portrayed in arguing his case. He cannot help but win converts with his ability for incisive debate and clear thinking on tough problems.

Senator MANSFIELD, whose award is being given, in the words of Hinckley Institute Director J. D. Williams, "For best exemplifying the traits of courage under fire, for leadership and legislative skill," has served in Congress for a quarter of a century.

He served five terms in the House of Representatives prior to his election to the Senate in 1952. He is now serving his third term in the Senate. Senator MANSFIELD is best known nationally for his leadership of the Democratic majority of the Senate, and for his work in achieving legislative compromises in the best tradition of our American governmental process.

On behalf of the Utah delegation in Congress, I salute Senator MANSFIELD on his receiving the Arthur V. Watkins Distinguished Congressional Service Award. I am hopeful and confident that the Senate and House of Representatives will each year henceforth produce a man of Senator MANSFIELD's caliber to be so honored.

#### WOLVES AND SHEEP

MR. FANNIN. Mr. President, much has been made of the present administration's concern for the American consumer. We have received a message here in the Senate telling us how much the President plans to do in this field. He speaks almost as if he were the only one concerned about consumer problems.

Mr. President, I suggest that the President's programs, as sent to the Congress, could stand some examination as to their truth in packaging. Apparently the administration feels that the country is operating in a vacuum of information and that the majority of the populace can neither read the newspaper nor listen to radio or television.

The President promises that he will assure every American "a fair and honest exchange for his dollar." Yet we have example after example of waste in the poverty program; corruption in the AID programs; employees of the State Department spending 2 years of their time

without doing any meaningful work; the Government Printing Office, charged with churning out title after title of studies nobody seems to need or want—are you in the market for a dictionary of witchcraft or a study on the sex life of a remote beetle? Well, these are the kinds of projects your hard-earned tax dollar is going for.

Mr. President, it has come to my attention that the average American taxpayer spends some 2 hours and 26 minutes of each 8-hour working day just to pay his Federal, State, and local taxes. That is more than twice the amount of time he spends to earn enough to take care of any other single item in his budget.

When the tax load reaches this proportion, Mr. President, it is time for us to ask ourselves, and to ask of those proposing more and more Federal spending, if the American taxpayer is going to stand for any more. Are we willing to burden him with more and more that apparently accomplishes less and less?

In this same general area, Barron's, a national business and financial weekly, has published an excellent article on "Wolves and Sheep," a note on the Government drive to protect consumers. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**WOLVES AND SHEEP: A NOTE ON THE GOVERNMENT DRIVE TO PROTECT CONSUMERS**

"There is in the land a certain restlessness, a questioning," President Lyndon Johnson observed in a widely quoted passage from his recent speech on the State of the Union. Last week, in presenting to Congress his fourth Message on the American Consumer, the Chief Executive unwittingly explained why: whether they fully realize their plight or just suspect it, people these days are living dangerously. True, in recent years Big Brother has sought to protect them against fireproof clothing and blankets, tire blow-outs, impure meat, perilous toys and cars unsafe at any speed. Nonetheless, the hazards to U.S. health and welfare, not to mention life and limb, somehow continue to escalate in the most unnerving way. Specifically, the White House gave the country eight new dangers to worry about, including "hazardous radiation from television sets and other electronic equipment," "death and accident on the waterways," and gamy fish and poultry.

To guard the citizenry against all the ills to which flesh (and fowl) may be heir, the President's Message urged a sweeping series of "reforms," including passage of the aptly named Wholesome Poultry, Fish and Fishery Products Acts; the Recreational Boat Safety Act; and the Deceptive Sales Act, which would broaden the powers of the Federal Trade Commission. On its own authority the White House announced plans to appoint a Consumer Counsel at the Department of Justice, "to serve the Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs" (Miss Betty Furness). The Executive also organized a Cabinet Committee on Price Stability.

The '68 legislative model reflects the skills of master political craftsmen, the expertise of those who know what will sell. Yet it offers no money-back guarantee—quite the contrary—and, if it came from Akron or Detroit, undoubtedly would run afoul of Truth in Packaging. Some of the health hazards cited above are either exaggerated or non-existent; authorities of the American College of Ra-

dology in Chicago, for example, last week rejected official claims that television sets (while possibly numbing to the mind) constitute a physical threat to viewers. None of the proposals carries a price tag (although motorists are footing a fantastic bill for still-unproven safety devices). Least acceptable of all, the whole program serves to conceal the countless ways—from artificially high farm prices to deliberate debasement of the currency—in which the powers-that-be are bilking the consumer. If wolves knew anything about public relations or propaganda, they too might wind up tending sheep.

On both counts the welfare statisticians could teach Madison Avenue a thing or two. They're great at coining slogans and names—War on Poverty, Wholesome Poultry Products Act, Clean Air Act—which subtly suggest that the desired ends justify unspecified means. They're unsurpassed at whipping up causes and crises out of little or nothing. Since Ralph Nader showed them how, they've thrown the book at one industry after another. A leaky gas main in Brooklyn? Crusading Congressmen promptly dump into the hopper a dozen bills to assure safe pipelines from Texas to Canada. Somebody cut corners on horsemeat? Crack down on the intrastate packers. Thirteen hundred casualties per year in pleasure craft (most of whom doubtless fell victim to faulty seamanship or strong waters) and the President launches the Recreational Boat Safety Act of 1968, which would empower the Secretary of Transportation to "set and enforce safety standards for boats and equipment." It's no accident that Betty Furness, who earned enough peddling refrigerators for Westinghouse to escape such mundane chores as shopping, wound up as the White House Consumer Advisor. ("Betty is a terrific drawing card," confided a Presidential aide, "and she's a great witness on the Hill.") She also has more brass than most pitchmen. In a speech to the American Advertising Federation last week, she branded the refrigerator a product about which consumers, far from being sure, scarcely know which end is up.

Miss Furness made no sales in the trade, which promptly produced an effective rebuttal. "Betty is mixed up," said one manufacturer, who pointed out that industry standards cover far more than cubic footage, as she claimed, while life expectancy varies from one appliance to another and from household to household. Other parts of the U.S. consumer package are equally deceptive. Thus, at a recent meeting of the American College of Radiology, experts scoffed at official concern over radiation from color television sets. The furor, they charged, is largely propaganda on the part of the U.S. Public Health Service, which really aims to promote "useless and costly industrial radiation protection." Exaggeration and distortion, of course, are the very stuff of consumerism. Thus, the 1962-63 Corvair, which Ralph Nader succeeded so thoroughly in maligning, has stood up very well in court. Litigation in five cases to date has yielded three verdicts in favor of General Motors, one against (which the judge subsequently set aside) and one hung jury.

If the hazards are largely illusory, the costs have grown frighteningly real. Back in 1961, before the consumer acquired a White House champion, a Congressional committee estimated that federal efforts in his behalf occupied the time of 64,714 employees and cost nearly \$1 billion per year. Since then, of course, the need for men and money has multiplied. What might be termed the indirect costs of consumerism—as car buyers today are painfully aware—have mounted faster. In the last two model years, Detroit by law has been forced to install a variety of expensive, awkward and largely unwanted devices which may or may not have reduced air pollution or furthered safety, but unmistakably have helped raise prices by some \$200

per car. Eighteen months ago we observed: "Thanks to an unholy alliance between doctrinaire scientists and eager demagogues, as of 1968 an estimated \$500 million per year will go out the tailpipe and down the drain." If the mandatory safety extras are included, the total bill runs three times as high. Dollars-and-cents aside, the cost in freedom of choice to buyers and sellers alike is incalculable.

In the best of times the price would not be right. Today, when government is squeezing the consumer right and left, it smacks of adding insult to injury. Thus, with White House blessing the U.S. Department of Agriculture is seeking authority to establish huge grain reserves, which not only would cost the taxpayer nearly \$2 billion, but also, in the fullness of time, firm up the sagging wheat market and raise the price of bread. USDA has upped the support price for fluid milk from \$3.24 per hundredweight to \$4, highest in history; in their zeal to milk the consumer, the fat cats in Washington also are pressing a drive against the so-called filled product, which, by substituting vegetable fat for cream, saves the housewife a few cents a quart. Meanwhile taxes and the cost-of-living keep climbing inexorably, to the point where despite unprecedented prosperity, most breadwinners find it harder year by year to make ends meet. Betty Furness makes a great pitch, but what she's selling these days is no bargain.

On the contrary, government today strikes us as a vastly overrated and over-priced service, which, come November, may bump up against an astonishing degree of buyer resistance. "Our goal must be to assure every American consumer," said Lyndon Johnson last week, "a fair and honest exchange for his hard-earned dollar." Washington is the place to start.

**PASSENGER TRAIN SERVICE DISCONTINUANCES**

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recent passenger train discontinuances and the number of pending applications for discontinuance are a cause of growing concern throughout the Nation. In Missouri alone, there were approximately 61 passenger trains which were discontinued or for which permission to discontinue service was requested in 1967. The number of applications has not decreased this year to date, but rather has increased.

The inability to obtain adequate rail transportation, or rail transportation at all, is working a severe hardship on the traveling public, military personnel, colleges, and businesses.

S. 2711, which was passed by the Senate last December would relieve the immediate impact of notices of discontinuance filed with the ICC by providing that a discontinuance or change in service could be carried out only upon order by the Commission. Legislation is presently pending in the Senate which would provide for an immediate moratorium on all train discontinuances. I hope that final action will be possible prior to the end of the 90th Congress on legislation to relieve the growing hardship faced by those dependent on railroad passenger service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Missouri Public Service Commission related to passenger train discontinuances be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolu-



tion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION, STATE OF MISSOURI, MISSOURI  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Whereas, there have been numerous passenger train discontinuances of recent date; and

Whereas, there are numerous applications for discontinuance of passenger trains now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the various state commissions; and

Whereas, the recent action of the Post Office Department has materially reduced passenger revenue; and

Whereas, the welfare and safety of this country is being materially injured by such discontinuance; and

Whereas, the Missouri Public Service Commission knows of its own knowledge acquired from several such applications before it and the participation in such hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission that such facts are true;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Missouri Public Service Commission joins its sister states in appealing to Congress to call an immediate moratorium on all train discontinuances and to investigate and determine the impact these discontinuances are having on the welfare and safety of our country including its national defense.

This Resolution adopted by the Commission this 23rd day of February, 1968.

"THANK GOD FOR THE RIBBON  
CLERKS"

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on February 14 I was privileged to attend the annual dinner meeting of the Greater Ogden Chamber of Commerce where Mr. Thomas M. Goodfellow, the president of the Association of American Railroads and chairman of the Golden Spike Centennial Commission, was the guest speaker.

His remarks, entitled "Thank God for the Ribbon Clerks," is a most interesting speech dealing with the type of men who rose to prominence in the railroad industry and eventually were the driving forces in building the Transcontinental Railroad.

Mr. Goodfellow has performed a valuable service by pointing out some very interesting and illuminating history dealing with the driving of the Golden Spike at Promontory, Utah, in Box Elder County. The State of Utah is preparing, along with many other interested organizations including the Golden Spike Centennial Commission and the Association of American Railroads, to celebrate this great centennial. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Goodfellow's remarks be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THANK GOD FOR THE RIBBON CLERKS

(Remarks by Thomas M. Goodfellow, President, Association of American Railroads and Chairman, Golden Spike Centennial Commission, at the annual dinner meeting Greater Ogden Chamber of Commerce, Ogden, Utah, February 14, 1968)

In your neighboring state of Nevada—and a few other places—people play a game which, I'm told, is almost completely unknown in Utah. The game's called poker.

I won't undertake to explain the game, because I don't play it myself. But I understand that guys who have good cards like to raise the bet and say:

"Let's get rid of the ribbon clerks."  
I say: "Thank God for the ribbon clerks."  
Let me tell you why.

Many people played a part in the fulfillment of the "impossible dream" which created the first transcontinental rail route. But history looks upon four men—Stanford, Huntington, Hopkins and Crocker—as the great force behind the project.

These men—who became widely known as The Big Four—were essentially grocery, hardware and ribbon clerks when they hatched their dream. But destiny had big things in store for them.

The hardware merchants—C. P. Huntington and Mark Hopkins—became financial geniuses.

The grocery clerk became a master organizer and a political leader whose name has been preserved through a renowned university at Palo Alto.

Charles Crocker, the dry goods man—the ribbon clerk, if you please—rose to command a legion of men in a construction undertaking that was for its day an incredible engineering feat.

Whenever you have men whose lives rival the stories of Horatio Alger; whenever "impossible dreams" are consummated . . . myths and mysteries spring up, some major and some minor. This was true of the men and events which came together at Promontory.

In the time your program committee has graciously asked me to occupy, I'd like to explore three areas briefly:

First, I'd like to pay passing attention to a few of those myths and mysteries. Actually, I'll just barely mention a couple to illustrate the kinds of speculation, confusion and differences which often arise after great events.

Second, I'd like to pay deserved tribute to the people of Ogden and all of Utah for their contribution to a great moment in history—and their efforts to preserve the greatness of that moment.

And, third, I'd like to look ahead a little so that nobody can reasonably conclude that we are conducting eulogies for a dead horse—a dead iron horse, that is.

As I said at the opening of our Centennial Commission office here last week, thoughtful men—and some not so thoughtful—for a hundred years have enjoyed discussions, and sometimes arguments, about what went on just before, during and just after the Driving of the Golden Spike on May 10, 1869.

What do they discuss or argue? As I said, I'm only going to mention a few items from many possibilities.

They wonder about the absence of Oliver Ames, president of the Union Pacific, who missed the historic ceremony. They say that the ceremony was delayed a couple of days because Dr. Durant, sent to represent Ames, was taken hostage by irate workers. It seems there was a little problem over delayed pay envelopes. And Oliver Ames had stayed back East to raise the money.

Those who like to wade around in the statistics of history enjoy differences of opinion on the number of ceremonial spikes used. They like to speculate on whether the Golden Spike was driven, just tapped or was never taken out of Governor Stanford's railroad car.

And what about the ultimate destiny of the polished laurel tie from California? Was it really destroyed in the San Francisco Earthquake years after its supporting role at Promontory?

Many people are sure they have the answers to most of the questions that have arisen concerning the Great Day at Promontory. But others are equally positive about different answers to the same questions.

And there are more areas of disagreement. For example, many people are credited with attendance at the Golden Spike Ceremony

who weren't actually there. True history was "adjusted" more than a little bit by artist Thomas Hill, who was commissioned by Leland Stanford to paint a portrait of the ceremony which would be more complimentary to certain dignitaries than was the classic photograph by Colonel Savage.

The famous Savage photograph didn't show certain people who wanted to be seen favorably. And it wasn't very favorable to some it did show.

Also, it has been embarrassing to some that the picture shows bottles being passed as the locomotives touched noses. Would you believe, as some purists have suggested, that these bottles contained water from the Atlantic and the Pacific, and that their exchange at this event symbolized the uniting of the two great oceans? Or would you go along with the less romantic who never have believed that the bottles held anything but booze?

These questions touch upon some of the mysteries and myths of the Day They Drove the Golden Spike. Or was it the Day They Didn't Drive the Golden Spike?

The questions also bring out a small basket of slightly soiled linen and give such linen the special detergent of air, sun, and a light touch—which may be the only attention such linen deserves. At the same time, it's probably best that we beat the sensationalists to the punch—or at least get on the record that we are aware of skeletons in our own closet.

The central element in the whole drama, of course, was the Golden Spike itself. The Golden Spike was fashioned from \$400 worth of gold by San Francisco jewelers whose bill, including the cost of engraving 381 letters on the spike, was \$25.24.

Napoleon Bonaparte said: "What is history but a fable agreed upon?" The purchase of Manhattan from the Indians for \$24 may be a "fable agreed upon." But the fashioning and engraving of the Golden Spike for \$25.24—another real bargain—seems to be more fact than fable.

Less publicized—but apparently equally true—was the bulbous nugget which was part of the original Golden Spike. The nugget was broken off before the Ceremony and shortly made into golden watch fobs and rings for President Grant, Secretary of State William H. Seward and a few other major dignitaries.

One of the select recipients was William B. Ogden, whose name you may have heard somewhere before. Mr. Ogden had been president of the Chicago and North Western, the first mayor of Chicago and the first president of the Union Pacific. He was a moving spirit behind the miracle which came to dramatic conclusion at Promontory.

It was 99 years ago this month that the railroad . . . building westward from Omaha . . . entered Utah Territory, headed for Wasatch. From that day to this, the people of Utah have been identified with "the strength and glory" which had its cradle at Promontory.

In endorsing proposed federal legislation which sought to establish the Centennial Commission a couple of years back, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall said:

"Perhaps no single event contributed so much to the development of the West than the completion of the first transcontinental railroad across the United States."

Many can take pride in that great "single event." For example, labor—represented here tonight and on the Centennial Commission—can take special pride in the 10 miles of track laid in one day . . . April 28, 1869. This was a legendary labor of Herculean proportions, setting a track-laying record that has never been equalled without mechanical aids.

Those track layers did more than set a record. They played a vital role in confirming the "manifest destiny" of America. Their performance marked the end of pioneer days

... the end of the frontier ... the birth of the modern West ... the unity of the country.

On one side of the Golden Spike these words were inscribed: "May God continue the unity of our Country as this Railroad unites the two great Oceans of the world." If this was a prayer, it must have had a good reception.

With the Driving of the Golden Spike, we stopped being compartmentalized into The North ... The South ... The East ... the West. We became a united nation—physically and spiritually—and with results unsurpassed in all of history.

It is appropriate, therefore, that the National Golden Spike Centennial Commission should have deliberated all day today—as we have done—on the best ways to give proper attention to the Centennial which will occur on May 10, 1969.

It is fitting, also, that these initial activities have been held in Ogden. The people of Ogden—and the people of all Utah—have long been dedicated to the perpetuation of the meaning of the Golden Spike and have worked hard at it. Many of the leaders of that dedicated effort are here tonight.

The National Commission is happy indeed to have such people working shoulder to shoulder in a common effort to make the whole nation—and hopefully much of the world—aware of the significance of the Golden Spike.

The late President John F. Kennedy summarized this significance in his own special way when he said:

"We need not read deeply into the history of the United States to become aware of the great and vital role which the railroads have played in the opening up and developing of this great nation. As our frontier moved westward it was the railroads that bore the great tide of Americans to areas of new opportunities and new hopes. It was the railroads that linked together the diverse segments of this vast land so that together they might create the greatest economy that the world has known."

But wherever you have a vibrant economy you also have changes. Your own city is a good example. Ogden was a trappers' rendezvous before the coming of the railroads. It then became a junction city for major railroad interests—as it still is.

Ogden also became a major air city, with a major installation for the Air Force logistics command. This is appropriate. This is the Air Age. My trip out here yesterday illustrates the point. It was wonderful. In less than five hours, I had my lunch in Washington, my dinner in Ogden ... and my luggage in Los Angeles.

The events symbolized by the Golden Spike gave all of transportation—including aviation—a great boost. It's proper that we look back in commemoration. But we should look ahead, too. The future will most certainly hold great opportunities for all modes of transportation.

Of course, the nature of transportation functions will change—as they have been changing. This is as it should be. Ducks can swim better than they can run. Each mode of transportation should capitalize on its inherent advantages.

The role of the railroads in the next century will be vital—but quite different from their role in the century to which our Centennial Celebration will do honor.

Thoughtful people know that the song of the railroads is going to be "tote that bale." They know that railroads are going to be in the business of hauling goods, not people. People left the stage coach and the covered wagon for trains. And people left the railroads for the convenience of the automobile and the speed of the airplane over great distances.

This still leaves a big job for railroads—which reminds me of a story.

If I can believe the elevator operator, this hotel—probably not just by coincidence—bears the name of a little mountain in central Scotland on the east side of Loch Lomond. As it happens, Scotland makes a beverage which—according to legend—Winston Churchill used occasionally.

A delegation from a powerful temperance organization once visited Sir Winston and the spokeswoman said:

"Mr. Prime Minister, we've calculated your lifetime consumption of alcoholic beverages ... up to yesterday ... and have concluded that the quantity would fill this vast room to a height of 4 feet, 2 inches."

Mr. Churchill took a ruler from his desk, carefully measured 4 feet, 2 inches, placed a chalk mark on the wall, stepped back to survey the 8-foot-high room and his chalk mark, and said: "So little done; so much to do."

The railroad industry has done much for this country—and it is only just and proper that we pay homage to the golden past. But in a very real sense there is "so much yet to do" for our nation and our people.

All of you have heard the predictions about the future population of these United States—and the world. Greatly increased population is going to mean greatly increased production and distribution. We're going to need lots of good transportation. Dependence on railroads is going to grow and grow—many times over.

The railroads are getting ready to do the job. They've jumped into the Cybernetic Age with both feet—and they've landed on the run. They've been on a dead run ever since, keeping pace—and sometimes leading the pack. They've been making themselves lean, hard and efficient for the important work that lies ahead.

The railroads sense that their "manifest destiny" is not yet fulfilled, and they are eager to get on with the job. Your understanding and your obvious interest will be helpful toward that end. The job involves the strength and prosperity of a great nation ... and the health and welfare of a great people.

The job is truly worthy of our energy and time—and I thank you for yours.

#### NEED FOR LABOR LAW REFORM

Mr. FANNIN, Mr. President, strikes by public servants are increasingly in the news. Every day we seem to hear of new trouble spots. It may be garbage men in New York, or teachers in Florida.

Who knows when the Teamsters may organize the fire truck drivers and present a municipality with its wage demands while a major blaze goes unchecked? Will policemen man picket lines while bank robbers have a heyday?

I do not wish to be misunderstood. There well may be merits to many of the problems encountered by these public employees. It is obvious that we are going to have to change the system, or abandon it, when unskilled, starting garbage workers in New York City get \$500 more than a beginning teacher in one of the highest paying county educational systems in the Nation.

It is obvious, at least to me, that union demands, fanned by irresponsible union leadership, have contributed to this imbalance. This points to still another far more difficult problem. That is, the long-term damage that has been done by letting big labor and their ambitious leaders, who are often out of touch with the rank and file, possess an inordinate amount of economic power. This is detrimental not only to the economy of the

Nation, but to the union members themselves.

Union leadership often conceals from its members the actual loss in numbers of jobs and economic opportunities occasioned by their demands for higher and higher wage settlements.

Mr. President, it is estimated that 25 percent of British workers are not needed on their jobs. But the Labor government of Britain has sanctioned this economic foot dragging by the unions, prevented industry from modernizing and we see the result in Britain's continued austerity programs, its balance-of-payments difficulties and a general lethargy, meaning lack of new jobs, in its economy.

Mr. President, I have three articles and editorials dealing with this problem. The first is an editorial published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, pointing up the need for labor law reform.

The second is a recent article from the Christian Science Monitor dealing with jobs and employment in Great Britain.

The third is an editorial from the New York Times concerning the problem of strikes against the public.

I ask unanimous consent to have these printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Report, Feb. 16, 1968]

#### A LESSON ON NEED FOR LABOR LAW REFORM

What happened in New York's garbage strike is symbolic of the worst that needs correcting in our labor-management relations, and the harbinger of even worse to come unless the public wakes up to the serious problem and demands that its rights be protected.

We can include the week-long teachers' strike in the Washington suburb of Montgomery County, Md.

It might be said in defense of the teachers that at least the \$6,340 base pay they will get as a result of their strike is about \$500 less than the garbage collectors are getting from what Mayor Lindsay called "a little blackmail." But that's beside the point.

The point is that union power and the thirst for even more of it—even among teachers—satiated by fearful politicians, has led to widespread disrespect for laws.

Thus, we see illegal strikes by the educators of our young, and illegal strikers who are rewarded by public officials under political obligation.

We get strikes by unions powerful enough to wring wage increases twice as much as productivity increases; wage increases which force unit labor costs so far out of line that they must be paid for by the consumer in higher prices (cost-push inflation), the investor in lower profits, or workers in jobs lost.

This is not surprising when a governor will seek a law to condone the violation of a law he himself put on the books to prevent the very conduct he now rewards.

This is not surprising when a national administration will encourage government employees to unionize—yet expect them not to strike!—and will condone union favoritism among supposedly impartial public officials.

If the trend continues, more and more of our cities will become a good "union town," as vote-seeking mayors like to call New York City—a city where only recently unions have killed four newspapers and the public has been hit by taxi strikes, transit strikes, teachers' strikes, shipping strikes,



parking-lot strikes, and the garbage strike, to name a few.

Unions of public employees are growing faster than any, predicting more trouble. In the present climate of labor relations, laws simply outlawing strikes of public employees won't do much good, says the Wall Street Journal. We agree. The WSJ's remedy merits consideration:

"Legislators who want to prevent these strikes could better spend their time reviewing things like labor's anti-trust exemptions, the lenient laws on union involvement in politics, and labor control of NLRB."

The National Chamber is urging labor law reforms and has conducted numerous workshops across the country to mobilize the business community into action. Giants are slow to get aroused, but they can.

It wasn't long ago that our plea for spending cuts seemed to be falling on deaf ears. But no longer. An aroused public finally made itself heard in Congress. We have similar hope for the need for labor law reform.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

#### PLANT CLOSINGS DRAMATIZE REAPPRAISAL IN BRITAIN

LONDON.—Plant closings in British industry are very much in the news, with significant meaning for British workers.

The new state-owned British Steel Corporation which runs the renationalized steel industry has announced that it will close two production units in Yorkshire on May 11. Six hundred workers will lose their jobs.

The merger of Associated Electrical Industries, Ltd., with the General Electric Company, Ltd. (of Great Britain) means the closure of a fairly obsolescent plant at Woolwich near London. Nevertheless it employs 5,500 people, and the closing has received much publicity.

There are others. They include the decision of Crompton Parkinson, Ltd., a subsidiary of the Hawker Siddeley Group, Ltd., to close an electrical-engineering plant at Chelmsford not far from London and transfer the work to Loughborough in the East Midlands. Some 1,370 people must leave their jobs or their homes.

#### RELOCATION RESISTED

Another closure may come from the merger of Davy-Ashmore, Ltd., of Sheffield with Loewy Robertson, Ltd. Five hundred men would be affected.

The speed with which trade unionists have been able to organize a one-day strike against the Woolwich closure points to one of the main difficulties in British industry.

British workers expect in many cases that their work will be brought to them and not that they will have to go to a new location to keep a job or find a new one.

In the case of Crompton Parkinson, for instance, the transfer of the work to the East Midlands is less than 200 miles from Chelmsford. But few workers in the south are prepared to move north after their jobs.

This question of workers following their jobs is going to be a major issue for British industry in 1968.

Before long there must be a reappraisal of factory locations by the newly merged motor-vehicle giants, Leyland Motor Corporation, Ltd., and British Motor Holdings, Ltd., parent company of the British Motor Corporation, Ltd. The new group, out to challenge in size and efficiency the rest of the world's automobile industry, has a scattering of factories from Scotland to the South Midlands. Rationalization is likely to be severe, and jobs will be moved.

Some of the plant closings are hitting and will go on hitting the prosperous southeast of England and the Midlands. The trend will favor those areas where there are inducements from the government to set up new factories.

#### UNIONS SUSPICIOUS

As regards economic policy this is a sign of success. Old factories are closed down and the twilight industrial areas get new ones. Successive British governments have been striving for years to do what these closures are about to do.

But organized labor is deeply suspicious.

Trade-union officials, of course, are paid to help their members keep their jobs. But also in this small, crowded island people are loath to move to new areas, especially the English. The Scots, Irish, and Welsh are better at moving because they have had more practice. But even in their areas pockets of resistance to moving exist, especially in the coal fields.

Unlike the United States, Britain has no frontier tradition, no West for young men to go. Regional attitudes are long established, and the social system is conservative and static. People can be tempted away very often only by the certainty of better housing.

Mergers and closures are adding also another kind of mobility problem—among executives. Part of British industry's conservatism and reluctance to take risks is due to senior managers' reluctance to face the prospect of unemployment.

#### SAVINGS CUSHION SMALL

Salary levels and the tax systems give senior executives little opportunity to save. They are heavily dependent on their fringe benefits and pension rights. They have little liquid capital.

In consequence they cannot chance unemployment. If they take risks on policy decisions for their companies and they are wrong, they must accept responsibility for their mistaken judgment and leave.

They cannot afford to wait long between jobs. There is, therefore, a thin market in Britain for good men who have made a mistake.

Yet all able men can be wrong once in a while. If they cannot find environment in which to try again, then enterprise itself cannot be vigorous.

But the sweeping changes now occurring in British industry may force good men to seek new jobs. So in 1968 mobility may well be forced upon British employees at all levels of responsibility.

[From the New York Times]

#### ARBITRATING PUBLIC STRIKES

The hardships inflicted on New York City by the garbage strike have now brought two significant developments toward improved community protection against further disruptions of essential public services.

Governor Rockefeller has asked the five labor experts who drafted the Taylor Law prohibiting civil service strikes to recommend any changes that might increase its effectiveness. The Governor's action is of special importance because of the damage he himself did to the law by sponsoring a proposed settlement that would have rewarded the sanitation strikers for their illegal walkout.

The other welcome development is a suggestion by George Meany, A.F.L.-C.I.O. president, that civil service unions consider making a voluntary commitment to submit disputes with their municipal or state employers to binding arbitration. Recourse to just such a method of impartial determination provided the final peace formula in the garbage tie-up after political gamesmanship in Albany had ruled out hope of settlement through direct negotiations.

Mr. Meany signified last October his support for arbitration as a sound method for breaking deadlocks in the Federal civil service, but the almost universal union attitude up to now has been one of total opposition to such a solution in state and local agencies.

Mayor Lindsay has made plain his own eagerness to explore broader use of arbitra-

tion as a peace device in this city, even though there may be legal barriers to overcome. Perhaps the Meany statement will give the Mayor some union partners in his search for more sanity in the negotiation of municipal union agreements.

A principal focus in the Taylor Law study initiated by Governor Rockefeller will be the desirability of continuing the present exemption from state control of the New York City Office of Collective Bargaining. That office was set up by the Lindsay administration and unions representing most of the city's employees to provide independent machinery for keeping the peace in the civil service.

When the original plan was announced two years ago, we warned against the danger that public unions would interpret some of its provisions as creating an implied right to strike—a right they did not have under state law or under the long-standing principles of common law.

The sanitation union, which chose to boycott the O.C.B., was outside the reach of the state's Public Employment Relations Board as well. Such a twilight zone of immunity from all the procedures created to insure protection for the public and for those who work for the public is obviously intolerable. No group is better qualified to suggest correctives for these and other defects in the existing statutes than the men to whom the Governor has assigned that mission.

#### AMERICAN BUSINESS LEADERSHIP

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as the days fall off the calendar and political events crowd the front pages of the newspapers and the airwaves of radio and television stations, I would like to take just a moment of the Senate's valuable time to speak of the material conveniences and the creature comforts which we enjoy in America and how they came to be. They were—and they are and will continue to be—the result of American ingenuity, enterprise, invention, research, development, labor, management, and distribution. They are to a substantial degree the result of the process which we call American business.

It happens, in my judgment, that some of us take these comforts and conveniences for granted, and also take for granted stereotyped views of American business. We see the organization man, the faceless corporate executive, the tycoon, the efficiency expert, the adventurer, and the automation. In point of fact, however, the so-called business world is made up of droves of hard-working, thoughtful, perceptive people as different one from another as people in other fields of human endeavor. These business people seek, generally speaking, to improve the world they live in.

As a member of the Select Committee on Small Business of the U.S. Senate I wish now to commend to your attention a recent speech by Mr. Robert Sarnoff, president of the Radio Corp. of America. Mr. Sarnoff seeks to erase a false picture of American business leadership which some people see and to present to us a true picture of business leadership. He says that business leaders help us to build a strong and peaceful society. He says, too, that men and women who enter the "business world" will find plenty of opportunity for personal satisfaction and for building a better world. I believe that his words are worth reading.

I ask unanimous consent to permit Mr.

Sarnoff's speech to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT W. SARNOFF, PRESIDENT, RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA, TO STUDENT ASSOCIATION, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, PALO ALTO, CALIF., JANUARY 22, 1968

I'm pleased to be here and to be able to congratulate each one of you on reaching the high level of learning represented by this fine graduate school. When you get this far, you're assured of at least one of the benefits of higher education. Now, if you get into trouble, you'll do it intelligently.

My last visit to Palo Alto was a year ago when we dedicated our RCA center for the development of computerized instructional systems. I dropped by this morning and was delighted to find that our staff is making great progress. They are perfecting a system which is programmed not only to teach but also to make application for grants and sabbaticals.

The computer revolution is spreading throughout society. As you are no doubt aware, it is giving rise to a whole new terminology in business. The term "random access memory," for example, refers to the technique of writing an expense account three weeks after the event. "Business simulation" is, of course, the flurry of activity that occurs in any office during the unexpected visit of an executive vice president. And "information retrieval" is the swift pursuit and recovery of a memo that was hastily written after a two-martini lunch.

The computer is but one of the many forces that are reshaping the business world in ways that should hold special interest for you and your contemporaries. Your generation has demonstrated a refreshing skepticism about the quality of American life and a healthy concern about the direction of American society. What is more, you have shown a willingness for the kind of involvement that is needed if you are to shape the future to meet your expectations.

Today, I would like to express what, in the light of current mythology, may be considered a revolutionary thought. I suggest, first, that a career in business will offer you as much opportunity for personal freedom and fulfillment as most other pursuits—as much, indeed, as you may care to seek. I submit, further, that as a member of the business community you will be able to contribute in a significant way to the progress and betterment of society.

I am, of course, aware of the common view of the business organization as a relentless machine, grinding out black-ink figures and gray-flannel conformists. This is a stereotype that performs a useful function, for it alerts business to the need for greater adaptability, wider acceptance of new ideas, and swifter response to change. However, like most stereotypes, it exists largely in the imagination.

As Max Ways has pointed out, the typical manufacturing firm of 50 years ago could afford a simple, mechanistic structure. It turned out only a single product which scarcely changed from year to year. Its production techniques were based on a stable technology, and its marketing approach on established methods and continuing demand. Its overriding concern was efficiency, which could be rigidly controlled and carefully routinized.

Today's corporation is a far more complicated organism. It may deal in scores, even thousands, of products and services. RCA, for example, produces over 12,000 different products. In the face of intensive competition and an expansive technology, corporations must conduct costly programs of research and development. Eighty per cent of RCA's products

today did not exist ten years ago. The modern corporation must be closely attuned to evolving public tastes and needs, and to the changing conditions of markets that may stretch around the globe. It must attract and hold men and women of varied talents—not only skilled managers, but scientists and engineers, architects, lawyers, ad men, and financial experts. The modern corporation, in short, must in many ways mirror the diversity of the society it seeks to serve.

Today that society has created a market that is growing in both complexity and affluence. The very ground rules of business are being changed by a resulting shift in emphasis from goods to services—from hardware to software. The United States has, in fact, become the world's first service-oriented economy.

In the two decades since World War II, business spending for services has tripled to some \$350 billion a year. Consumer service volume has quadrupled in the same period, rising nearly twice as fast as disposable income. We have felt the effects in my own company. Today, about half of RCA's total sales volume is in services—from computer programming to international communications, from broadcasting to car rentals.

This continuing shift has created a need for a new kind of management. The traditional manufacturing operation is characterized by substantial fixed capital, a moderately skilled work force and well-established techniques of marketing. The service enterprise is, in some ways, a more demanding intellectual exercise. There is less concern with fixed capital, and considerably more concern with people, specifically with training and keeping a highly-skilled force of white collar workers and technical specialists who are in pace with technological advance. The marketing of services is also more complicated, calling for analysis and interpretation of needs in relatively ill-defined and unorganized markets.

All managers, whether they are concerned with goods or services, must of course still pay close heed to the requirements of efficiency. But they must also look outward to the changing environment—to the external forces, whether economic, social, or technological, which bear on their operations. They must cultivate a widening awareness that may range from the labor market in Pennsylvania to the Indian art of Peru. We have come a long way since the day when John D. Rockefeller, Sr., agreed to say a few words for the newsreel cameras and declared: "God bless Standard Oil."

Modern corporations have been described as the "engines of progress." It is their function to organize the skilled manpower, the natural resources, the technology and the energy required to meet human needs. The corporation is a major channel for change. In the past three decades, it has evolved into a highly flexible, adaptable and creative force. One of its principal tasks is to help society apply its means to its goals. The modern corporation has reached the point, I believe, where it is now making a meaningful contribution toward solving some of the complex problems facing society. Its efforts are responsive to the mounting expectations of the public at large. Now, as never before, people believe that it is possible to plan and carry out solutions to major problems.

The list of major social problems is disarmingly familiar—urban blight, faulty education, persistent poverty, environmental pollution, congestion on highways and in the air. The problems are so deeply rooted and so widespread that they cannot be resolved by either business or government working alone. On one hand, they will require the financing, the coordination and the political expertise of government at all levels. On the other, they must draw on the resources of private enterprise, which now employs the bulk of the nation's scientific, engineering and man-

agerial talent, as well as nearly all its productive facilities.

Already new relationships between business and government are taking shape, and new approaches to social problems are underway. Companies with special competence in financing or construction are increasingly active in programs to upgrade urban housing and stimulate new business activity in depressed areas. Major technical enterprises, with long experience in systems engineering, are engaged in study projects to improve transportation and relieve traffic congestion. A number of leading corporations, including RCA, are working to apply advanced information technology to education. Their progress in computer-based instruction, as an example, may enable us to close within a few years the knowledge gap that now condemns far too many people to the welfare rolls.

Yet these efforts are only a beginning. They will be vastly expanded by the technological revolution which is increasing the capabilities of business management far beyond anything we have known. Within the past 15 years, we have seen a complete transformation in methods of communicating, processing and storing the facts and figures that are the lifeblood of business.

The instruments of this revolution are wideband microwave radio transmission, communications satellites, large-capacity data banks, and computers. All these are being brought together in systems that enable management to gather current information on any aspect of an enterprise at any time and over any distance. Conversely, they permit management decisions and programmed instructions to be transmitted instantly to any part of the enterprise. The result is a capability for unprecedented speed and precision in all our operations.

As communications channels have multiplied, the computer has moved into the front office. From its apprenticeship as a kind of super-clerk, it has developed into an immensely versatile reporter and analyst. Working with mathematical models of the enterprise, it can indicate in advance the possible effects of alternative business decisions. Fed with current data from all segments of a diversified company, it can serve as an early warning system to spot potential trouble.

Computers and wideband communications are now being joined by a new service to business—the time-sharing system. Many individual subscribers, each with his own terminal, can use a single computer at the same time over ordinary communication lines. Because of the vast speed and capacity of the latest computers, each subscriber has the effect of exclusive use. This is a truly revolutionary development. It brings the modern computer within the reach of thousands of small businesses, giving them far greater flexibility in responding to competitive pressures and changes in the market.

In these present trends we can discern the pattern of the future for management. I recognize that prophecy is risky: Ambrose Bierce defined it as the practice of selling one's credibility for future delivery. In this case, however, I feel that much of the risk is removed by the speed and predictable direction of technological progress.

We now face the early prospect of unlimited worldwide communications by sight, sound, data, and electronic printing. Soon management will, in effect, have the ability to be everywhere at once and to plan future strategy with reasonable assurance that its assumptions are valid.

The result will be to accelerate the growth of large conglomerate enterprises operating nationally and globally. It will hasten the trend toward decentralized profit-oriented operations, coordinated through advanced communications and management information systems.

The executive in New York or elsewhere,



without leaving his desk, will be able to deal face-to-face over a private television circuit with representatives in London, Buenos Aires or Tokyo. Through the split screen, sight and sound conference calls on a worldwide basis will become standard. The head of an international business will have at instant call the status of his overseas markets, the latest economic and financial developments, purchasing trends, and the inventory of his company to meet demand. The manager, expanding his operations at home, will use computerized teaching systems to retrain workers or equip unskilled labor for modern production.

We can begin to see that at every level of management, from the smallest to the largest enterprise, there will be heightened opportunity for individual fulfillment and advancement. With a central data bank, more managers at both divisional and corporate staff levels will have direct access to information needed for decision-making. This broader participation will mean greater opportunity for movement laterally and upward as individuals acquire experience in various portions of the total system which forms the enterprise.

The pattern is already emerging in some of our leading corporations. In RCA, for example, more than 5,000 individuals have been promoted to greater management responsibilities during the past five years. A substantial number of these have crossed lines from one division or specialty into another. Our top management now includes executives who have risen through finance, engineering, marketing, and production.

With this background, we are able to sketch in a few of the basic qualities that will distinguish tomorrow's manager—the man for whom we are now looking:

First, he will be of wider gauge than most of his predecessors, equally at ease with a computer print-out or an advertising layout. He will be a generalist with experiences in many facets of business, demonstrating the view that, while a rolling stone may gather no moss, it does pick up a good deal of polish. At the same time, he will be active in the civic and cultural life of his community. For he will recognize that, as business becomes more deeply immersed in the mainstream of society, the businessman cannot remain aloof.

Second, he will be an internationalist, either in experience or educational background or both. Whether headquartered in New York, London or Brussels, he will regard the world as his marketplace. He will take satisfaction in knowing that his efforts to stimulate worldwide trade and investment will promote more rapid progress, greater abundance, and brighter prospects for peace around the globe. I have hopes, indeed, that the international businessman may yet succeed where the international statesmen have so often failed.

Third, he will be a lifelong student. To keep abreast of the accelerating change in the techniques, the scope and functions of business, he will spend an increasing share of his time in study.

Like Michelangelo, his motto will be, "I still learn." The new instruments of information will permit him to obtain and absorb knowledge far more effectively—probably through a computer-based instructional terminal in his home. He may even attain the qualifications sought by so many of today's management recruiters—a man of about 35 years of age with 40 years of experience.

Finally, he will be a nonconformist in his approach to business problems. He will generate and accept new ideas, and encourage initiative and creativity among those around him. He will be bold enough to adopt unorthodox solutions for the sake of his enterprise and society, for tradition may offer few reliable guidelines in the years ahead.

We are on the threshold of an era when,

for the first time in history, society will organize itself around the processes of change. One of our greatest strengths in this new age will be an economic system which has often been misunderstood and has long been taken for granted. The profit motive is as old as man himself and is traceable, no doubt, to the first barter of a spearhead for a stone axe. Our profit-oriented economy has evolved bit by bit over the centuries, adapting itself to meet the changing needs of changing times.

Theoreticians have come forward from time to time with elaborate substitutes, whether More's Utopia or Marx's socialism. Their formulations, however, have served largely to reaffirm the need for profit as a motive and a measure. Their experiments have demonstrated that the difference between income and outgo serves as more than an essential reward for human enterprise.

It is also an indispensable gauge of performance and a guide in assigning values and determining priorities. Indeed, it is the key element that makes our system viable, adaptable and responsive to human needs. For 50 years the Soviet Union has abjured the profit system. Today, Russian economists and managers are in the process of re-inventing it.

The profit-oriented economy has demonstrated its indestructible character through world wars, international depressions, and civil insurrections. It has emerged from each of them stronger and more resilient than ever. But today in the United States it faces, perhaps, its greatest challenge. As a nation, we stand on the rim of a volcano of social unrest that has already erupted into fires of urban violence.

These fires can be contained and ultimately doused only by the combined and resolute efforts of every segment of our society—whether government and business, educators and scientists, or engineers and economists. Above all, there will be the increased need for leadership by skilled managers in the private sector. They must help marshal our resources, and harness them in the achievement of a progressive and peaceful society.

I commend you to the task. You will find it one of the great adventures of all time.

#### NEW YORK TIMES OPPOSES SUR-TAX AS ECONOMIC TOKENISM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Joint Economic Committee last week finished a 3-week period of hearings on the President's Economic Report. Of course, we all know that the administration foresees an economic boom that will force this country to choose between a tax increase and a serious inflation. But, as I have stated many times, there is persistent shortage of evidence about the boom. Demand is far from exuberant. Industrial production actually declined in January from the December level. Our industrial and agricultural capacity is underutilized. The workweek is short, and people are leaving the labor force rather than entering it, as would normally be the case in a boom. Also, we know that the low unemployment figure derives in part from the fact that many people have dropped out of the labor market. All these are negative omens.

An excellent editorial in today's New York Times, quite aptly called *Economic Tokenism*, hits the nail on the head. It points out that, in the absence of an increase in defense outlays or a resurgence of consumer demand, a tax surcharge would be a mistake, inasmuch as it would not take effect until the need

for it was over. Not only that: the editorial very perceptively indicates that, if military spending continues to rise, the tax surcharge would be an inadequate device. The increasing pressures of war expenditures would require the kind of economic controls that this Nation has had to adopt in previous wars. I agree with the New York Times. The administration's call for a tax surcharge is a gesture of economic tokenism.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### ECONOMIC TOKENISM

Even though serious problems confront the economy, there is still scant evidence of the runaway boom in economic activity that Secretary of the Treasury Fowler and other Administration officials have been predicting for so long in their campaign for a 10 per cent income-tax surcharge. Consumer demand is good but not ebullient. Industrial production is just barely above the levels of a year ago, which means that manufacturers continue to operate with a good deal of idle capacity. While corporate profits and individual incomes are high, the over-all picture is not one that indicates the tax surcharge is the most appropriate cure for what ails the economy.

Undoubtedly, a rise in taxes would have served to counter inflationary pressure and contain other distortions that have been plaguing the economy had it been proposed and enacted when the escalation in Vietnam initially forced a huge bulge in military spending. But then the Administration was intent on cutting excise taxes and expanding the credit supply. It argued that the economy could afford both guns and butter, grievously underestimating the mounting cost of the war it was waging.

This failure to formulate a realistic policy to pay for the war in Vietnam has been—and still is—extremely costly. It has penalized those on fixed incomes who have no real defense against inflation. It has reduced the war on poverty to the barest of holding actions. And it has placed in jeopardy the existing international monetary mechanism, which is based on a fixed relationships between the dollar and gold.

What has been done cannot be undone by simple resort to a 10 per cent tax surcharge. A rise in taxes would not necessarily curb demand for credit; in fact, it might lead to an increase. Similarly, it would not bring a quick abatement of inflationary pressure; on the contrary, the big unions would probably press even more insistently for wage hikes in excess of productivity and major corporations would, equally probably, attempt to protect their profits by continuing to raise prices. On top of all that the Administration's claim that the tax surcharge will help to erase the deficit in the nation's balance of payments is as questionable as its former view that tax reductions would do the trick. There is little hope of attaining equilibrium in transactions with the rest of the world so long as the war in Vietnam goes on.

If defense costs level off and demand remains moderate, it would be a mistake to enact a tax surcharge that would restrict demand and would not really take effect until after the need for it was over. But if military spending continues to rise, the tax surcharge will be a pitifully inadequate device for coping with a war economy. What would then be needed would be the panoply of economic controls that have always been found necessary—and acceptable—by the nation in time of war.

The Administration's call for a tax sur-

charge is a gesture of economic tokenism. It is not needed to cope with a boom that has not materialized. It is even less adequate to meet the demands of a new escalation in the war.

### U.S. EXPORTS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that the citizens of Missouri are waging a very vigorous battle to expand our exports to foreign countries.

In doing so, Missourians are helping our balance-of-payments problem, fighting starvation in less-developed countries, and winning new markets and new friends for the United States abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my special report titled "Missouri's Growing Role in U.S. Exports" be placed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**MISSOURI'S GROWING ROLE IN U.S. EXPORTS**  
(A special report by U.S. Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, February 1968)

Three years ago my staff and I prepared a report on the role Missouri was playing in U.S. exporting. We found that Missouri was meeting the challenges of world export markets. We learned that business and agriculture in Missouri were well on their way to making Missouri and Missouri products well known throughout the world.

I am proud to report that in the three years since my first report, Missouri has continued to expand her exports to foreign countries. The key reason has been the determination and hard work of private enterprise in our State. The new markets are there. Missourians are going after them and winning. This is a great success story in which we can all take pride.

Missouri businessmen have done an outstanding job in marketing their products in foreign nations. Exporting has been a new field for an ever increasing number of Missouri business firms. More and more of our businessmen are looking abroad for new buyers. We must do everything we can to continue this trend.

Missouri today has a number of veteran exporting firms. These are the companies which pave the way for new exporters. These are the companies which have the know-how and experience to aid exporters in the best methods and procedures. Missouri newcomers to the exporting field are able to start with the benefit of this experience. In this way, the Missouri exporter has become more knowledgeable, more imaginative, and tremendously more successful in his competition for world-wide markets.

While the methods of the individual Missouri businessmen have advanced, so also have the resources and facilities of our government agencies who are aiding exporters. The programs of these agencies, the experts involved, and the knowledge available have created in these agencies an invaluable aid to the private exporter.

Here we have the results of a tremendous program of cooperation between private industry and government. Missouri firms have been willing to expand their exports. Government agencies have provided advice and assistance.

Exporting has opened new markets for Missouri businessmen. It has greatly expanded the economy of our State. It has brought more jobs, increased plant space and more business for Missouri's transportation industry.

The farmers of Missouri have also been doing an excellent job of producing for ex-

ports. Agricultural exports from Missouri are rapidly increasing.

The exporting of Missouri products has been a joint effort combining the best talents of the Federal Government with those of Missouri businessmen and farmers. The results have been and will continue to be dramatic. This report will show just how dramatic these results have been in recent years. It will demonstrate how government agencies and private citizens work together. It will show just how great a part exporting plays in the life of the State of Missouri. It will show how great a part Missouri plays in the market places of the world.

The overall effect of Missouri exporting is immense. In order to more conveniently examine the components, this report will break down the exporting process into the activities performed by the various agencies.

#### MISSOURI-MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS

##### Department of Commerce

The Department of Commerce has continued its successful program of close cooperation with U.S. business in the expansion of the number and quantity of exports.

The Trade Expansion Act, which I cosponsored and helped pass in 1962, launched a whole new era in U.S. exports. It authorized the Department of Commerce to shift gears into full speed ahead for greater sales abroad. It has resulted in a greatly stepped-up program of exports both by Missouri and by the United States as a whole.

The Trade Expansion Act was a good act. I am proud to have aided its passage. The results of this act for Missouri have been clear and dramatic. I am proud to represent a State which has made such great progress in competition with the world.

Since the passage of the Trade Expansion Act, the Department of Commerce and its export expansion divisions have had the primary goal of publicizing exporting opportunities and interesting an ever-increasing number of companies in foreign markets.

With information from the Department of Commerce, small firms in Missouri, and their officers, have worked hard in recruiting other small businesses to enter the field of exporting.

Publicity has been a key measure in this recruiting. Programs designed to publicize the benefits of exporting have flourished throughout Missouri.

On May 19 of last year Governor Warren E. Hearnes proclaimed World Trade Week in Missouri. This week was also celebrated in many cities throughout the State.

Last year St. Louis celebrated World Trade Week with an all-day conference on board the River Queen steamboat, a meeting place symbolic of the more than 200 years of trading with the world by St. Louis businessmen.

Members of the St. Louis Regional Export Expansion Council, the World Trade Club, and the World Trade Development Committee of the Chamber of Commerce combined to staff and sponsor this program.

The St. Louis Chamber of Commerce devoted the entire May, 1967, issue of its magazine *Commerce* to the world trade activities of St. Louis businesses.

Also this year the World Trade Club of St. Louis is celebrating its 37th anniversary. This active organization now has nearly 300 members.

In Kansas City observance of World Trade Week has become a regular activity. The combined efforts of the area Chambers of Commerce, the International Trade Club, and the United States Department of Commerce are utilized not only for this yearly celebration but also in the year-long drive for export expansion. The goal is to bring to the attention of the community the importance of international trade in providing jobs and assisting in the distribution of products.

Last year the theme of the Kansas City celebration was a salute to West Germany.

This nation is the largest importer of the products produced in the Kansas City area.

The Kansas City Women's Chamber of Commerce sponsors an annual World Trade Week dinner at which area firms are honored for their promotion of exports.

Also in Kansas City the International Trade Club has provided an added ingredient to the program of export expansion. This club has 275 members representing 216 firms in the Kansas City area. It has proven very successful in the recruiting of new exporting firms.

Cape Girardeau featured World Trade Week with the Chamber of Commerce and the Rotary Club taking sponsorship of many of the activities for the week. The highlights of the celebration were a 30-minute television program dealing with world trade and a World Trade Week luncheon.

Similarly, the Chamber of Commerce of Caruthersville presented an all-day "South-east Missouri World Trade Conference" at the First State Bank of Caruthersville.

These and many other programs like them throughout the State indicate the full commitment Missouri has made toward expansion of its exports to foreign countries.

Of course there is much more to exporting than simply recruiting. The problem is to aid willing firms in obtaining markets for products. The U.S. Trade Centers and the U.S. exhibitions at International Trade Fairs, Trade Missions, and other international displays provide excellent opportunities for exporters to show their products to consumers in other nations.

U.S. Trade Centers are permanent merchandise marts. They present to the exporter the opportunity to test and develop select markets for his products in areas where there are both a demand for U.S. goods and the financial resources for payment. Located in London, Stockholm, Frankfurt, Milan, Bangkok, and Tokyo, these centers provide a schedule of promotions featuring selected lines of U.S. products.

As of July 1, 1967, some 6,316 U.S. firms had displayed their products at 187 Trade Center Shows. From these displays more than 1,700 agency relationships have been established. Sales from these shows and the continuing agency relationships have totalled many millions of dollars.

Over 50 Missouri firms have participated in 60 different Trade Center shows since this program was initiated in 1961. Since 1964 this number has been 38 firms exhibiting in more than 40 Trade Center Shows. Three times as many Missouri firms have participated in these shows in the last three years as had in the previous three. This is a clear indication of the rapid increase of interest and participation of Missouri firms in the export market.

Missouri firms which have had particular success in recent Trade Center Shows include Sunnen Products Company of St. Louis, the Salvator Company of Kansas City, and The Mark Andy, Inc., of Kirkwood. Two firms, Roll-O-Sheets Inc. of St. Louis and The Vendo Company of Kansas City reported being successful in appointing Swedish agents for their products as well as showing a high volume of sales. The Vendo Company achieved the top sales results of the Swedish show.

Missouri's firms have also participated in the U.S. Commercial Exhibitions which are staged at major international trade fairs. These exhibitions in effect are salesrooms for American goods in the leading markets of the world.

These exhibitions are similar to the U.S. Trade Center Shows in that they also are programs featuring single lines of products. Since this is the case, each show presents the products in this line that are manufactured by producers from all states. Thus Missouri firms have been competing very successfully with these firms for foreign markets.



Since 1963 2,972 U.S. firms have participated in 67 Trade Fairs. 1,073 agency relationships have resulted from these trade fairs. Thirty-two Missouri firms have participated in 35 of these fairs since 1963.

Missouri businessmen have also continued an active participation in the U.S. Trade Mission Program. A Trade Mission is comprised of a select group of businessmen organized to carry specific U.S. trade and investment proposals to international markets. The mission members represent the entire U.S. business community and travel under U.S. government auspices.

Industry-Organized Government Approved (IOGA) Trade Missions have also been important to the development of U.S. exporting. This type of mission is organized by industries, industry associations, or State groups at the members' expense. The missions receive official government approval. The missions are organized to transact overseas business on the spot. The transactions are for the firms actually represented in the mission as well as for the members of the organizations represented.

As of June 30, 1967, the Department of Commerce had guided 207 U.S. Trade Missions since the program was begun in 1954. This number includes 62 industry-organized groups. These missions have visited and transacted business in 104 countries. Since 1964 there have been 73 Trade Missions. However 51 of these have been of the industry-organized type. This indicates the recent trend of great private industry interest in exporting. It is profitable for the industries of the United States to export.

These missions have carried a total of 18,740 business proposals from U.S. industry to overseas businessmen. These resulted in 18,878 new trade and investment opportunities. In the active years since 1964, the missions carried 6,761 proposals and returned with 7,192 opportunities.

Twenty-four Missouri businessmen have served on U.S. and IOGA Trade Missions. Fourteen of these have been since 1964. This again indicates the emphasis Missouri has placed on industrial exporting in recent years.

Recent U.S. Trade Mission participants from Missouri have been: Mr. Lee Carter, Vice-President of R. W. Booker and Associates and Mr. Francis J. Fabick, Secretary of John Fabick Tractor Company. Both companies are located in St. Louis.

The 1964 Missouri Trade Mission to Europe has resulted in a continuing business for many Missouri firms. One chemical firm has realized over \$160,000 in sales as a result of this mission. Another firm has reported substantial sales of beef tongues and livers.

In the coming year there are U.S. Trade Missions planned for Pakistan, East Africa, Chile/Paraguay, and Ivory Coast/Cameroon. Also approximately 35 Industry Trade Missions are anticipated for the next twelve months.

We can expect active participation by Missouri businessmen in all of these events.

The Field Offices of the Department of Commerce have greatly stepped up such activities as organizing and conducting seminars, workshops, business conferences, and consultation programs. It is in activities such as these that the participation of those who already export is of great importance. These are the ones with the know-how and ideas which can and do prove invaluable to those who are just entering this field. Of prime importance also is the example they have set. They have shown that Missouri businesses, especially the smaller firms, can export and can do so profitably.

During the period from January 1965 to June 1967, businessmen in Missouri profited from the 185 export oriented activities sponsored by the Department of Commerce.

An even better program is seen for the future. As an example, a major export study,

the 1967 St. Louis Export Trade Seminar under the sponsorship of the Metropolitan College of St. Louis University, was held from September 18 through November 6. This seminar consisted of eight weekly meetings which proved highly beneficial to those businessmen who attended.

The success of all these activities has been further guaranteed by the expertise lent to them by members of the Export Expansion Council, the Chambers of Commerce, and the World Trade and Traffic Clubs from all over the State.

Another program of the Department of Commerce is the giving of "E" awards. These awards are presented for outstanding achievements in exporting. Missourians can be very proud of the record of their businessmen in the winning of this award. The first time that an "E" award was won by a Missouri firm was in 1962. Since that time twelve more Missouri companies have won these awards.

The Field Offices of the Department of Commerce are located in Kansas City and in St. Louis. In addition to organizing workshops and seminars, these offices have been very active in distributing trade leads to Missouri firms. The Field Offices begin with information received through the United States Foreign Service and "International Commerce" magazine. Then through the use of a complex recording system, the Offices are able to coordinate the capabilities, products, and expansion policies of the companies in Missouri with the product demands which are received.

In 1965 and 1966 over 10,000 trade leads were distributed by these two offices. The offices also supply marketing aids for each country in which a firm may be selling. This is all in addition to the supplying of information on upcoming trade missions and trade exhibitions which would be of specific interest to the various firms in Missouri.

As a result of these and other promotional efforts, there have been 106 Missouri firms identified as new exporters since 1964. This is indeed an impressive record.

What does all this exporting mean for the people of Missouri. One Missouri based firm, Monsanto Company, had foreign sales of \$343,000,000 in 1966. This represented an increase of thirty-two million dollars from 1965. Approximately 21 percent of Monsanto's total sales are to foreign countries. Wagner Electric Corporation estimates that 400 jobs in the company are attributable to export sales. These are two examples of the dramatic effect of export sales. Through these two firms alone a great number of jobs have been created because of exports. Exporting has also caused the small firms to have a dramatic effect on the economy of Missouri.

In comparing the exports of certain industries for the years 1960, 1963, and 1966, we clearly see that the rate of growth of Missouri exports of manufactured products has been outstanding. Of course much of the goods represented in these figures are produced by larger firms, but a major amount is also the result of exporting by small firms.

[In millions of dollars]

	1960	1963	1966
Chemicals and allied products.....	22.6	28.9	40.0
Machinery except electrical.....	26.3	26.8	59.0
Transportation equipment.....	9.9	13.0	96.4
Stone, clay, and glass products.....	9.1	12.7	20.3
Electrical machinery.....	8.3	10.5	17.5

The total exports of all manufactured products for these years were 175.1, 204.6, and 369.8 million dollars. From 1960 to 1963 there was a 17 percent increase in foreign sales of manufactured products. This increase was an impressive 80.0 percent from 1963 to 1966.

#### National Export Expansion Council

The National Export Expansion Council serves as a committee to advise the Secretary of Commerce on all matters under his jurisdiction which affect American exports. It also assists in expanding American export trade by providing leadership and guidance to the Regional Export Expansion Councils in their trade promotion activities.

The National Council is composed of 70 leading business, labor, and professional leaders. Included in this membership are the chairmen of the Regional Export Expansion Councils and the heads of prominent national associations directly concerned with export expansion. Members are appointed to the Council by the Secretary of Commerce. Representing Missouri on the National Council are Mr. Hector R. Dominguez, Vice-President, First National Bank of St. Louis, and Mr. Victor C. Studley, Vice-President, Commerce and Trust Company, Kansas City. These men also serve as chairmen of the Regional Export Expansion Councils headquartered in their respective cities. A recently appointed member to the National Council was Mr. R. Hal Dean, of St. Louis, President of Ralston Purina Company.

There are presently 42 Regional Councils. Each of these is located in a city where there is a Department of Commerce Field Office. Eighteen Missourians serve on the Kansas City Regional Export Council. Twenty-nine east Missouri business leaders have been invited to serve on the St. Louis Regional Council until June 30, 1969.

As part of the "Target 10,000" programs, a National Export Expansion Council sponsored activity, members of these two very active Regional Councils had made 1,056 contacts with prospective exporters through 1965.

The "Commercial Exhibits Participation Program" was initiated in 1966. Under this program members of the Regional Councils call on Missouri exporters and potential exporters to inform them of significant opportunities for the exhibiting of their products in Trade Center Shows and Trade Fairs. In working through this program, the two Missouri Councils made 239 contacts throughout the State in 1966. They had already surpassed this total in the first six months of 1967.

The goals of both Councils are basically the same:

- 1) To bring firms not now engaged in the export market into international trade.
- 2) To improve the export operations of firms now haphazardly in the export market, but not devoting major management attention to their overseas efforts.
- 3) To coordinate Council efforts with established Department of Commerce programs.

Both of these fine Missouri Councils have been doing outstanding work in the continuous achievement of these never-ending goals.

In Kansas City, members of the Council have been regular participants in seminars and workshops. Several acted as resource persons for the "In-Office Workshops."

The St. Louis Council devised an imaginative program to inform businessmen in that area of the numerous methods available for displaying goods in foreign markets. Members of the Council were divided into two All-Star football teams. Varying amounts of yardage could be gained for different activities. All these activities involved contacting businessmen and informing them of the advantages and programs in exporting. The yardage gained was tallied and a touchdown awarded for each 100 total yards. This spirit of competition combined with the enthusiasm of the members for export expansion, resulted in a very successful program.

Missouri businessmen have continued and greatly increased their very successful programs of export. Working with the Depart-

ment of Commerce these businessmen have set a record of which all Missourians can be proud. As never before Missouri manufactured products and the name of Missouri is being seen all around the globe.

#### Small Business Administration

The Small Business Administration has eliminated its Office of Foreign Trade. This has to a large degree taken the Small Business Administration out of present direct export expansion efforts.

However there have been long standing cooperative efforts between the SBA and the Department of Commerce Field Offices. These have resulted in co-sponsorships of conferences and courses on international trade. There has also resulted a strong promotion of small business firms for attendance at International Trade Fairs.

Prior to the discontinuance of the Foreign Trade program, the Small Business Administration office, located in Kansas City, had contacted 239 Missouri firms to interest them in attending 22 Trade Fairs and Missions. Since then the office has kept over 750 Missouri firms advised of Export Executive Seminars which are co-sponsored by the Department of Commerce and the University of Missouri at Kansas City.

In its counseling the SBA has continuously advised potential exporters to expand sales through foreign trade.

Eight free publications dealing with exporting for small businesses are available from the Small Business Administration. Also a booklet entitled "Export Marketing for Smaller Firms" may be purchased.

#### The Export-Import Bank

The Export-Import Bank has continued its vital function of providing credit for U.S. exporters. Through various short and medium term guarantees and insurance, the Export-Import Bank has made available a total of \$1,814,000 in 1966 and \$2,509,100 in medium term guarantees and insurance in 1967 to the exporting firms of Missouri.

These figures represent funds available to firms which are headquartered in Missouri. It does not include funds used by firms with headquarters out of state but with branches in Missouri which produced products for export.

The Bank has retained its medium term commercial bank credit guarantee program. This program enables banks to finance medium term American exports without recourse on the exporter for payment on any defaulted payment. The Bank guarantees against loss arising from political causes and against loss due to commercial risks.

The Eximbank has also continued its program of export credit insurance issued jointly by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association (F.C.I.A.) and the Bank.

#### EXIMBANK ASSISTANCE FOR EXPORTS FROM MISSOURI IN FISCAL YEARS 1966 AND 1967

	Contract value	Eximbank liability
I. Eximbank medium-term guarantees to commercial banks:		
Fiscal year 1966	\$1,675,514	\$1,327,900
Fiscal year 1967	2,269,412	1,839,700
II. F.C.I.A. medium-term comprehensive insurance:		
Fiscal year 1966	645,384	486,100
Fiscal year 1967	831,343	669,400
	Aggregate policy limit	
III. F.C.I.A. short-term policies:		
Fiscal year 1966	\$4,990,000	
Fiscal year 1967	6,215,000	

The aggregate policy limit for the F.C.I.A. short-term loans refers to the maximum amount of exports which may be outstanding under the policy at any one time. This figure is only an approximation of the exports shipped during the respective fiscal

years since an exporter may ship more or less than his aggregate policy limit during the course of the year depending on the rapidity of turn-over of his export business.

These figures are amounts to firms with headquarters in Missouri. However very often prime contractors in other states will subcontract a large portion of the work to firms in still other states. In this way Missouri firms would be receiving Eximbank aid in addition to that indicated by these figures.

Conclusive figures are not available for these sub-contracted portions. However, the Boeing Company has provided data on its contracts since 1960. Missouri from 1961 to 1966 had received about 99 million dollars under subcontract from Boeing. It would be fair to assume that such subcontractors have benefited indirectly from the Eximbank direct credits to Boeing.

Contracts awarded to other major contractors outside of Missouri and aided or guaranteed by the Eximbank have similar benefit for other Missouri firms.

#### Agency for International Development

By providing foreign assistance, the Agency for International Development is deeply involved in the exporting of American products. Through the "Catalog of Investment Opportunities," investment surveys, investment guarantees, local currency loans, and dollar loans, the Agency participates daily in the American export program. The percentage of foreign aid that is spent on U.S. exports has increased in the past few years—it is now over 80 percent. Therefore, the need for alerting U.S. business to the opportunities of the AID program has increased.

Missouri has had a growing role to play in AID exports to less-developed countries. During fiscal year 1966 Missouri was awarded contracts for direct export sales of manufactured products of \$4.8 million.

In fiscal year 1967 this figure dropped slightly to \$4,675,000. Missouri products sent under this program reached all parts of the globe. The major part, however, were sent to Central and South American nations and to the Far East.

Of this total in fiscal year 1967, St. Louis received \$1,616,310 while Kansas City was awarded \$1,931,937 in contracts. In addition, \$110,000 worth of agricultural machinery was purchased in Independence. This machinery is to be used in Chile and Tunisia.

AID has provided demand for Missouri agricultural exports also. In fiscal year 1966 this amount came to \$47.9 million. The largest part of this amount, \$26.2 million, was for wheat exports. Wheat flour, cotton, and feedgrains were the products receiving the next largest amounts.

The estimates for fiscal year 1967 for agricultural aid are \$48,025,000 million. This would represent an increase of about \$125,000 over 1966.

AID also provides funds to Universities and for technical service contracts. Both programs are designed to aid foreign nations. Under these programs we are exporting education and training rather than goods. In fiscal year 1966 Missouri Universities received \$2,480,509 for education programs which have a world-wide basis. Also \$156,000 in technical service contracts were awarded to Missouri firms in 1966. These provide aid to the Dominican Republic, Nigeria, and Vietnam.

#### TRANSPORTATION

To reach the great markets of the world, Missouri depends on the nation's transport carriers. We have long been dealing with the problem of transportation. We have made considerable progress toward establishing an efficient method of moving our products.

Missouri relies on the railroads and on trucking to ship heavy industrial export goods to the port of New York. We send much of our light manufactured export goods and most of our grains to New Orleans.

The Missouri and Mississippi Rivers have

continued to be major routes for the export of Missouri products. According to the Army Corps of Engineers the Port of St. Louis handled 9,791,000 tons of commercial freight in 1962. In 1965 this amount had increased although only slightly, to 9,797,503. The main reason for the lack of a greater increase has been the 1965 decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission which reduced freight rates for grains by train from port areas to the Southeastern United States. Thus in 1965, 325,799 tons of corn were shipped from St. Louis to New Orleans whereas in 1962 this amount had been 517,000. Similarly wheat shipments fell from 295,000 tons to 243,000 and soybeans from 317,000 to 90,000 tons.

The trucking industry has provided an efficient means for transporting Missouri products to our nation's seaports. Trucks carry 44.6 percent of Missouri's stone, clay and glass products out of the state. Trucks also carry 40.0 percent of the non-electrical machinery, 33.9 percent of the electrical machinery, and 29.5 percent of the Chemicals and allied products which are produced in Missouri and taken out of the state. Trucks thus carry approximately \$6.9, \$23.6, \$5.8, and \$11.8 million respectively of these products for export.

#### AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

In crop year 1965-66 Missouri ranked twelfth among all states in agricultural exports. Her total agricultural exports for this period were \$204,300,000. This is an increase of \$53.3 million, or over 35 percent since 1960. The main Missouri agricultural exports are soybeans, of which Missouri exports 9.6 percent of the national total or \$70.5 million; wheat and flour 8.1 percent or \$44.9 million; cotton valued at \$10.0 million which was 5.9 percent of the national total; and lard and tallow, 3.8 percent and \$6.9 million.

Agricultural exports have been a consistently increasing factor in Missouri farm production. In 1954 these exports accounted for 7.9 percent of the cash receipts from farm marketing. In 1966 this figure had become 16.5 percent.

In 1954 the national average for agriculture was a 10 percent dependence on exports. At that time Missouri was 2.1 percent below this average. In 1966 Missouri's 16.5 percent rate of export placed her only .5 percent below the national average of 17 percent. Thus the rate of expansion in Missouri over the period since 1954 has exceeded that of the nation as a whole.

Soybeans continue to be Missouri's largest agricultural export. In fiscal year 1966, \$70.5 million worth of soybeans were exported from Missouri. This represents about 35 percent of the total of agricultural exports from Missouri. The largest markets for soybeans were the Netherlands, West Germany, and Canada.

In fiscal year 1966 eight countries each imported more than one million tons of feedgrains, Missouri's second largest agricultural export. These nations were Japan, the United Kingdom, Canada, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. The value of Missouri's share of total feedgrains exported was \$37.8 million.

Other significant Missouri agricultural exports in fiscal year 1966 were wheat, \$34.4 million; wheat flour, \$10.5 million; cotton, \$10.0 million; lard and tallow \$6.9 million; meat and meat products, \$4.3 million; and hides and skins, \$4.3 million.

Japan continues to be one of the major importers of Missouri products. In 1966 Japan purchased the equivalent of \$39,404,000 worth of Missouri products. This is a 30 percent increase over 1960. Approximately 75 percent of this total was for agricultural products. Soybeans are the leading Missouri agricultural product exported to Japan. In 1966 we exported \$17,431,000 worth of soybeans to Japan. Japan also purchased over \$5 million of Missouri corn and over \$2 million



in grain sorghums in 1966. She also purchased over \$8 million of products manufactured in Missouri.

As never before the agricultural products of Missouri are reaching the markets of the world. The know-how of the Missouri farmer is being used to aid other nations in that his increased production makes exporting possible. This in turn aids the economy of Missouri and of the United States in that these sales are mainly dollar sales and these dollars are earned by Missourians.

#### SUMMARY

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which I supported, opened the way for the vastly increased program of exporting that Missouri has experienced during the past five years. The Act has provided the go-ahead. Missouri has provided the know-how and products.

In fiscal year 1966 Missouri exported manufactured products with a total value of \$369.8 million. This amount represented an increase of 80 percent over the value of these exports in 1963. In agriculture also, the growth of exports has been impressive. The 1960 total of \$150 million increased 33 percent by 1966 when a total of \$204.3 million of Missouri agricultural products was exported throughout the world.

The Missouri export program is impressive not only for the great increase in the amount of exports, but also for the great involvement by so many new Missouri business firms in exporting. The various activities of the Department of Commerce and the work of the St. Louis and Kansas City Regional Export Expansion Councils have brought the idea of exporting into the sales programs of many Missouri firms. Since 1964 these efforts have resulted in 106 new Missouri firms entering the export field for the first time.

Missouri farmers are also following this trend of having more producers enter the export field. In 1954 exporting made up 7.9 percent of Missouri's farm marketing cash receipts. In 1966 exports accounted for 16.5 percent of these receipts. This clearly points to the outstanding job our farmers are doing. They have increased production for foreign markets while producing an abundant supply of food here at home.

I believe the theme of Missouri's aggressive and successful export program has been cooperation. This cooperation has been made possible by the 1962 Trade Expansion Act and the determined leadership of highly capable Missourians. We knew this was a good Act when we first started fighting for it. The recent history of Missouri exporting clearly indicates that many goals of this Act are being met. This program of cooperation by the government, the farmer, and private industry for exporting will continue to reap great rewards for Missouri as well as for the whole nation.

We have made great progress, but we still cannot be satisfied. Congress must continue to be concerned. There are still barriers to be broken. I think Congress should hold public hearings to consider new legislation in this session to guarantee that our trade programs continue to move forward even more rapidly in the future than they have in the past. We must not allow the progress we have made to be undermined by other nations who refuse to cooperate in trade expansion, or by those who call for harmful trade barriers here at home.

#### WORLD WAR II ALLIED POWERS HAVE OVERWHELMINGLY RATIFIED GENOCIDE CONVENTION—UNITED STATES NOT AMONG THEM

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the United Nations General Assembly nearly 19 years ago drafted, discussed, and then adopted unanimously the Convention on Genocide.

Approximately 6 million human beings of terror and barbarism of the Third Reich. These were innocent people brutally put to death because their ethnic and religious background did not suit the Nazi master plan.

So far, 70 nations have voted approval of the Genocide Convention.

Of the nations who formed World War II Allied Powers, 37 have ratified the Human Rights Convention on Genocide.

The list includes the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, France, Greece, India, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia. Other powers which declared war on the Axis and have since ratified the Genocide Treaty include: Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Philippines, Turkey, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Of the European Axis Powers, both Italy and West Germany have ratified the Genocide Convention.

Ironically, the United States, which was principally responsible for bringing to an end this years of cruelty and mass killing, is not among the lists of these countries who have gone on record as opposing this horrendous type of international crime.

It is a bitter fact to realize that our country, a world leader and inspiration to freedom-loving nations, has yet to join other nations in outlawing the practice of genocide internationally.

I urge the Senate once again to give its advice and consent to the Genocide Convention.

#### INTERSTATE COMPACT AND OIL ALLOWABLES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President (Mr. GRIFFIN in the chair), my duties to certain committees on which I serve made it impossible for me to be in the Chamber earlier during the period for the transaction of morning business, to respond to an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post on yesterday. I would have responded earlier had the editorial been directed to my attention.

It is particularly unfortunate that from time to time great newspapers such as the Washington Post must rely upon employees who perhaps have had very little experience in the subjects about which they write, and, therefore, spread more misinformation than light about matters under consideration in the Senate and in the Congress generally. It is very unfortunate that a newspaper of the prestige of the Washington Post would publish an editorial as completely ridiculous as that which appeared on Monday, February 26, 1968, under the heading, "Senator Long's Sleeper."

Mr. President, in that editorial the editorial writer states that I introduced a bill (S. 1826) which would give Louisiana a larger share of offshore oil revenues, and it said that the bill contained a "sleeper provision."

If I recall correctly when I introduced that bill I made no speech explaining it. I simply introduced the bill and it was

referred to the appropriate committee, which was the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bill speaks for itself. All one would have to do is read the bill and he would see precisely what the bill would accomplish.

I did not press for immediate hearings on the bill. I wanted the Interior Department to report its views on the matter and I wanted the Department of Justice to report its views on the matter. After they had explained what they found meritorious, if they agreed with me, and what they found was without merit, I thought we could then press for hearings on the matter.

I did not offer it as an amendment on the floor of the Senate. I simply introduced the bill, I may say, at the request of the conservation commissioner of Louisiana, other people interested in the matter of oil conservation, and those who were interested in Federal-State relationships. The bill is simply there for people to study and to determine what they think about it. They will either agree with it or disagree with it. If they do agree with it then we would welcome such action as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs should think appropriate.

The editorial states that the so-called sleeper provision as contained within the bill would "compel the Federal Government to limit output from the offshore fields in accordance with the cartel quotas set by the contiguous States."

Mr. President, it has been the view of every one of those persons who had the power of decision in the State governments, as well as those who had the power of decision in the Federal Government, that the conservation practices with regard to oil produced on the Continental Shelf outside the State boundaries should be entirely consistent with the conservation practices with respect to oil produced inside the State boundaries of the United States.

Accordingly, the Department of the Interior and those with the power to decide Federal policy generally in this area have left to the States to set the quotas for offshore production as well as production within the 3-mile limit of Louisiana, and the uplands as well. That is the existing practice.

The bill I propose would, among other things, continue the existing practice, which could not have been adopted for any other reason except that the executive branch of the Federal Government under a Republican President and two Democratic Presidents has felt that this would be the proper way to handle this particular problem.

The editorial refers to the quotas for the so-called allowables that are prescribed for wells both on the outer Continental Shelf and elsewhere, as "cartel quotas." Mr. President, nothing could be more in error.

Inasmuch as the editorial writer in this instance apparently knows nothing about allowables, it might be beneficial to educate the Washington Post writer so that he would be acquainted with the facts with respect to so-called "cartel quotas."

The situation is that the oil and gas industry of this country has the capacity

to produce more oil than we have places to store it. The best place in the world to store oil until you have a market for it is to keep it where the good Lord put it there in the ground, in the natural reservoir where it exists, and where it is not being depleted or evaporated so that the product is available at such time as one would desire to take it out of the ground.

Some of these offshore wells could produce as much as 500 barrels a day. Most offshore wells are very good wells and in view of the great expense of drilling and operating offshore wells, it is appropriate that they would be good wells. If we were to open up those wells and produce as much as they are capable of producing, it would mean that a great number of the little people inland who have wells producing 5 or 6 barrels a day would be unable to find a market for the oil they produce from their little wells.

For example, some little independent, producing with a well in north Louisiana, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Mississippi, Wyoming, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, or Kentucky, would not be able to sell his oil because these big companies which have these large offshore wells would naturally use their own oil before buying oil from the little fellow who might be producing oil from beneath 40 acres owned by Grandpa Jones and Grandma Jones, with the result that those small landowners would lose their little royalty incomes while those big companies which produce oil on the Outer Continental Shelf would increase their production at the expense of the little people who are not in a good position to compete.

The way in which the production of oil in this country has been controlled has been to try to reach agreement among the States as to the share of the market each State would produce, and then to allocate production among the wells existing in that State so that the oil would not be wasted.

Mr. President, conservation is usually regarded as a good practice in this body, and I believe that even the Washington Post thinks well of conservationists, people who believe in the conservation of resources and who wish to make the best use of them.

There was a time when if someone discovered an oil well, before someone could drill on adjoining property, he would try to get all of the oil he could. One way in which it could be done would be to dam up a hollow and trap all of the oil he could produce as fast as he could produce it before his neighbor could dig a well and get any oil. Once a fellow did that, the first heavy rain would fill up the hollow with water, the oil, being lighter, would be on top of the water. It would flow down the stream, kill all the fish, and pollute the streams. That was a poor way to produce oil. It left most of the oil in the ground. Produced in a more gradual fashion it is possible to recover 10 to 20 times as much oil as would be recovered if one took all the oil he could get as fast as one could produce oil.

Then, conservation came into the picture and people learned to produce oil more gradually so as not to reduce the

recovery of the wells. They also learned that it was a bad practice to have more oil above the ground than they had sales for. In other words, if the producers had no sale for the oil it would be best to leave it in the ground rather than to have it overflow in the storage facilities, pollute the streams, and flow down into the Gulf of Mexico, the Atlantic Ocean or Pacific Ocean, and pollute the oceans as well.

So, good conservation practice, which I would imagine even this editorial writer would approve of, if he understood it, would require that we not produce more oil when we had filled up all the storage space aboveground which we had available for it. In addition to that, good conservation practice would require that we not even fully fill storage tanks if we did not have a market in prospect for what was in storage. Why suffer evaporation unnecessarily, or why pay for storage above ground when it is free where the oil is? That is the so-called cartel quota to which the editorial writer makes reference.

Those quotas are not fixed by the oil companies. They are fixed by the States which have oil production within them. They are fixed by the States, looking to the capacity of each State to produce oil in consultation among State authorities and with the proper authorities in the Federal Government, which also has an interest in this matter.

The editorial indicates:

With this compulsory cartel of domestic producers and the mandatory quotas for imports, the petroleum industry is heavily shielded from the forces of competition.

Mr. President, we do not have allowances for oil in order to cut competition among producers. This is one of the most competitive industries there is. There are thousands of producers of oil in this country. It is an enormously competitive industry. The profits made by the industry are less than the average for all manufacturing industries. As a matter of fact, it is a depressed industry at this time due, in large measure, to the large oil imports from overseas. The industry is not shielded from the forces of competition because it is a very, very competitive industry, so competitive, in fact, that today great numbers of independents are being driven out of it.

Well do I know. If anyone wants to buy a drilling rig at a sacrifice price, he need but go to Louisiana, where he will find that the little independents cannot compete under the current state of affairs with the so-called heavy shielding where that is indicated. Members of my own family have engaged in an effort to explore for oil and gas, and we found, too, we could not compete with the big companies, particularly with the big reserves which they are finding offshore, where only the major companies can afford to go and explore the possibilities. Just as other independent producers have found, relatives of this Senator have found that they, as independents, could not compete. The independent oil producers by the hundreds are being driven out of business because they cannot compete with the large oil producers who own huge wells being discovered on

the Outer Continental Shelf. Far from being "heavily shielded from competition," the fact is that competition is extremely vicious in that industry and in which hundreds of people who have been in the business for a lifetime are rapidly being driven from it at considerable loss.

Let me go on to indicate some other errors in the editorial.

It states:

The Federal Government follows the "allowables"—

Which is correct. And then it says:

But it was never compelled to do so under the law.

Well, Mr. President, the fact that the Government has been doing this under a Republican President, and under two Democratic Presidents, and under several Secretaries of the Interior appointed by those Presidents, would indicate that the Federal Government must think it is right. I know that the State governments think it is right to have an allowable system by the Federal Government that is parallel to and consistent with the system that exists elsewhere.

Now I come to a choice statement by the editorial writer, referring to the junior Senator from Louisiana:

He had read Attorney General Ramsey Clark's splendidly critical report on the operations of the Interstate Compact.

Mr. President, how does the writer know that?

I do not know who he is, but I wonder whether he knows who I am because this Senator has never read Ramsey Clark's opinion.

I am too busy with my responsibilities as chairman of a committee in the Senate and as the assistant majority leader of the Senate to keep up with everything that some Cabinet officer writes. It is about all I can do to keep up with the messages of the President, he is so prolific, much less the messages to which every Cabinet officer may affix his signature.

I have not read Ramsey Clark's "splendidly critical report." I would not know what it says or does not say. I think that I know the arguments which have been expressed for or against the interstate compact that relates to oil and gas production among the States. I would imagine, or I can surmise, what some of the critical remarks would be if someone wishes to be critical of the industry. But may I inform the editor writer on this matter, that he does not know what he is talking about. I have not read that report. I have not seen it. I did not know there was such a report in existence. All he had to do, to find out whether he was telling the truth or a barefaced falsehood, was to ask one simple question, which he did not bother to do, and that was to inquire of me, or anybody in my office, whether I had read Ramsey Clark's "splendidly critical report."

I am not saying whether the report is right or wrong. I do not know, because I have not read it. A public relations man or some minor hireling of the Justice Department must have informed the editorial writer that his boss, Ramsey Clark, authored a "splendidly critical report" on the interstate compact.



Then he goes on to say:

And he is also cognizant of the fact that Congress only renewed the compact for 2 years, not 4, as the industry had hoped.

Mr. President, I did not even particularly have that in mind. I was not cognizant of it. It made no particular difference to me whether the interstate compact had a year, 2 years, or 4 years to run. The oil-producing States generally believe that that is the appropriate way to do business. I suppose that when the compact expires, a resolution will be introduced to extend it, be it for 2 years, 4 years, or 6 years. But I must tell the editorial writer that he is wrong again. I do not know whether the compact has 2 years or 4 years to run, and I could not care less. When it expires, some Member of Congress will seek to extend it, or I may introduce a resolution myself to indicate that the compact should be extended.

The editorial writer then makes the statement:

The response is a back-door attempt to put the federal government in a legal strait-jacket.

Mr. President, that is not a back-door attempt; it is a front-door attempt. I introduced a bill in the Senate and had it referred to committee, so that anyone could examine it and say whether he agreed or did not agree with it; so that we could find out what Attorney General Clark, Secretary of the Interior Udall, and everyone else thinks about it. That is the kind of information that I would like to have available for the record. I would like to know what any interested party thinks about the bill, just as I think most Senators who have any pride of authorship at all would like to know whether people agree with them, and if so, why.

The editorial writer then says that—

The matter should be rebuffed by those who are concerned about the consumer interest.

Let me make it clear that all that this particular provision of the bill seeks to do is to maintain an existing situation; it does not seek to change it. It seeks to continue it. It proceeds on the assumption that what a Government agency—a hireling of one of which probably planted the editorial—are at present doing in this area, and what they have been doing for 10 years or longer, is correct; and that if the procedure is right or correct, it should be continued. It is that simple.

If the Senator from Louisiana has done something wrong by introducing a bill to continue the practice, and to write it into law, as it has been done in the past, it was wrong for the department whose hireling planted the editorial, to do what it has done by engaging in such a practice. If it is wrong in doing so, it ought to stop it.

So far as I am concerned, I believe that what I have done is right, and right to the extent that the practice ought to be continued. I was never informed prior to introducing the bill that there was any real determination by the executive branch that the practice to which I referred should be changed.

It should also be made clear that when one speaks in terms of monopoly, it is well to keep in mind that the big offshore wells could produce a great deal more than they are presently producing. If they are to produce to capacity, then this means that the little fellow, the independent, will be compelled to produce less, because the big offshore wells are owned by the major oil companies, which also own most of the refinery capacity.

Experience has proved that these major companies, as they properly should in their own economic interest, are going to put their own oil through their own refineries before they buy oil from someone else to put through their refineries. The result is that small, independent producers, producing oil from privately owned lands of citizens of the United States, will be pressed to the wall. They will have difficulty in finding a sale for their oil. If they are able to find a sale for it at all, it will be strictly on the buyer's terms.

These major companies, even if they buy the oil at a sacrifice price, are not going to sell the products to the public any cheaper than necessary. They will continue to price their own oil as they price it now. Even if they obtain the oil more cheaply from these independent producers, they will price the product of the refinery to reflect the price they would get if they were selling petroleum produced from their own wells, so long as competitive conditions among the refiners and marketers permit it.

So, in the final analysis, if one wanted to keep competition alive, he would want to protect the small producer and the property owner who has benefited from oil being found on his farm, and permit the continuance of the practice and program which has enabled the little fellow to compete with the big one. He would try to preserve the thousands of independent producers in this country, instead of trying to drive them out of business.

I regret that one should write such a poorly informed editorial, knowing as little as he does about the matter. I hope very much that in the future, when this great newspaper sees fit to attack the Senator from Louisiana and makes statements that I know something or do not know something, it would undertake to inquire whether the statement is right or wrong. I would like the newspaper to just undertake to ask a simple question and I shall be glad to give the answer.

I am pleased to see that on that same editorial sheet appears another editorial, entitled "Drugs: Risks and Profits," which was a very well informed editorial. I doubt that it could have been written by the same person who wrote the editorial entitled "Senator Long's Sleeper," because it appears that whoever wrote the former editorial understands something about the fight the Senator from Louisiana and others have been making to try to assure that the public would get good drugs, of the best quality, at reasonable prices.

The Senator from Louisiana has labored in that vineyard long and hard, and he has been very much gratified by the fact that Mr. Morton Mintz, a writer for the Washington Post, and others on

that great newspaper, have supported efforts to obtain for the public a fair price and good quality, protecting the consumer both with regard to the price and the quality.

While taking issue with this great newspaper which seeks to single out the Senator from Louisiana as an object of scorn, I am pleased to see that the newspaper on the same page did write a very worthy editorial about something the Senator from Louisiana is interested in—the effort to obtain for the public quality drugs at the lowest possible prices.

I particularly want to point this out because it is well that when one finds someone is doing something he does not agree with, he should criticize and take issue with it, and when he finds something that is commendable, he should commend him for it. I find nothing in this well-informed editorial about what the Senator from Louisiana did last year when he fought to see that those under medicare and medicaid would get drugs at reasonable prices, but I commend the newspaper for pointing out what Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, is doing in this area—efforts which I have applauded and work which I have undertaken to further on some occasions, myself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear in the RECORD the editorial I have criticized, entitled "Senator Long's Sleeper," and the fine editorial, of which I approve, entitled "Drugs: Risks and Profits."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SENATOR LONG'S SLEEPER

Legislators from Louisiana must perforce take an avuncular if not paternal interest in the fortunes of the petroleum industry, but the little noticed favor that Sen. Russell B. Long would bestow upon it reaches far beyond the bounds of familial interest. In a bill (S. 1826), the principal purpose of which is to give Louisiana a larger share of the offshore oil revenues, there is a sleeper provision that would compel the Federal Government to limit output from the offshore fields in accordance with the cartel quotas set by the contiguous states.

In 1935 Congress approved the "Interstate Compact to Conserve Gas and Oil," an arrangement under which the oil producing states establish output quotas which are based on estimates of how much can be sold without depressing prices. With this compulsory cartel of domestic producers and the mandatory quotas for imports, the petroleum industry is heavily shielded from the forces of competition. Through the instrumentality of government, its profits are maintained at the expense of higher prices to consumers.

In determining how much oil can be produced from offshore wells, the Federal Government follows the "allowables"—the quantities of crude that can be pumped from each well or field of wells—set by the contiguous states. But it was never compelled to do so under the law. Senator Long is now trying to provide insurance against political contingencies. He has read Attorney General Ramsey Clark's splendidly critical report on the operations of the Interstate Compact. And he is also cognizant of the fact that Congress only renewed the Compact for two years, not four as the industry had hoped. The response is a backdoor attempt to put the Federal Government in a legal strait-jacket. It should be rebuffed by those who are concerned about the consumer interest.

## DRUGS: RISKS AND PROFITS

Congressional interest in the pricing of drugs has undergone a fundamental change over the last decade. In the 1950s, the investigations of the late Sen. Estes Kefauver were largely concerned with how individual consumers were affected by monopolistic practices in the drug industry. But with the advent of the medicare and medicaid programs, the emphasis shifted. It is now the Federal Government—and the taxpayers as a whole—that bears much of the cost of drugs prescribed for insured persons. As a consequence investigations of drug pricing are no longer denounced as political fishing expeditions. They are now essentially inquiries into Federal procurement, the objective of which is to ascertain whether the Government is purchasing products of high quality at the lowest possible prices.

Terms such as "monopolistic pricing" and "market power" are frequently used in a loose fashion. But they can be given operational meaning. Industries in which monopolistic pricing practices are commonplace should enjoy rates of return on stockholders' investments which are far above the average. Judged by that criterion the drug industry qualifies. Recent testimony before Sen. Gaylord Nelson's monopoly subcommittee by Dr. Willard F. Mueller of the Federal Trade Commission shows that the leading firms in the drug industry topped all others in the country with a 21.1 per cent on stockholders' equity in 1966. The average rate of return was 13.3 per cent.

Spokesmen for the drug industry reply that the returns include a "risk premium," that the risk of loss on large research outlays is so great as to require a higher return on capital invested. But the weakness of their argument, and the statistical tests supporting it, is in the definition of risk. If the drug industry were really risky, we should expect to find a high rate of failures and returns on capital which are subject to greater than average fluctuations over time. But in the drug industry, where firms are protected by patent laws, the failure rate is very low and the above average profit rates are highly stable.

It would appear that discriminatory pricing practices—selling at low prices to hospitals and other institutions and at high prices to individuals through retail pharmacies—account in large measure for high profits in the drug industry. But the remedy lies in greater competition, not price controls. The Government should insist that all drugs used in the health program which it finances be purchased at the lowest possible prices. Patent policy should be re-examined with an eye to increasing competition in the industry, and more information about the properties and prices of drugs should be made available to the general public.

## ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR KNOWLAND

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a speech delivered by Hon. William F. Knowland, former U.S. Senator from California and a former minority and majority leader of the Senate, delivered before the United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association on February 5, 1968, concerning the grave problems faced by our Nation today, both foreign and domestic, and how they might best be handled.

Mr. Knowland's address is worthy reading.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, we are deeply engaged in the Far East for the third time in a little more than a quarter of a century.

Approximately 100 years ago William H. Seward, Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Abraham Lincoln, said:

"The Pacific with its shores, its islands and its vast regions beyond will become the chief theatre of events in the world's great hereafter."

We find ourselves enmeshed in a conflict we dare not lose for it would signal twilight of American prestige in the entire Pacific basin.

Yet we have failed to take the necessary steps to win the conflict or even to force a Korean type stalemate.

A "scuttle and run" policy, as advocated in some quarters, would give communism a great victory in Asia. It would dismay our friends in the Far East and would destroy the morale and will to resist of all the non-communist nations of Asia.

Neither General Dwight Eisenhower and the Allied Command in Europe, nor General Douglas MacArthur and the Allied Command in the Far East could have won the war against Nazi Germany or the war lords of Japan if they had been placed under the restrictions imposed upon General Westmoreland in Viet Nam.

It is my strong belief that a ten year war in Viet Nam, as contemplated in some quarters, would be far more costly in American and Allied casualties and in national morale at home than in taking the steps now to force the enemy to sue for an armistice now.

As a former Republican leader of the United States Senate, I repudiate those who charge that "this is President Lyndon Johnson's war."

As an American citizen who places his nation above any potential political gain to his political party I have been shocked at the organized efforts by riot and turmoil to prevent the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense from stating the case of the Government and the administration.

Even the President and Vice President of the United States have not been free from this type of pressure tactics by those unwilling to rest their case on discussion and the referendum of the electorate, but who seek to impose their will by gangsterism across the continent from the Pentagon in Washington to the induction center in Oakland.

These "direct actionists" went beyond any constitutional guaranty of "the right to peaceably assemble and petition their Government for a redress of grievances" when the pre-announced purpose was to occupy the Pentagon, the headquarters of our Defense Department, and to take over various induction centers and bring their operations to a halt.

This type of activity is not in keeping with constitutional Government and is treasonable to the whole concept of law, order and the functioning of a representative Government.

How have we come to this sorry state of affairs?

I give you my views as a former Minority and Majority Leader of the United States Senate, a former Delegate representing the United States in the General Assembly of the United Nations and presently editor and publisher of a metropolitan newspaper.

First of all I will stipulate that no citizen does or can have the information available to a President of the United States. Nor can any living man fully appreciate the awesome burdens of the Presidency other than our two distinguished past Presidents, Harry Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

These two men, as in the case of those who both preceded and followed them had tough decisions that involved the lives of Americans, our allies and our enemies.

But history is a great teacher, if we do not

ignore the events of the past which, of course, must be weighed in the light of the developments of the present.

Before the invention of the airplane and this immediate age of the inter-continental ballistic missile, President George Washington could contemplate a nation free from involvement in affairs abroad.

However, no American President of today has this choice. A Europe or Asia dominated by a totalitarian Communist power armed with atomic ballistic missiles does not give us this Atlantic or Pacific "moat of safety" around our present day castle of freedom.

A President or a citizen is always faced with calculated risks. However, we must not forget that this also applies to the ruling Communist clique in Moscow and Peking!

President Truman risked all out war at the time of the Berlin airlift, President Eisenhower when we landed U.S. forces at the request of the president of Lebanon, and President Kennedy at the time of the Cuban missile crisis.

In each case they contributed to the maintenance of a troubled peace. A backdown on our part then probably would have set off a series of events that could have resulted in war with the Soviet Union.

Now, as to some fundamental policy suggestions:

1. We should not commit large bodies of United States Armed Forces to combat without going to the Congress of the United States and asking for a declaration of a state of war.

This would eliminate much of the treasonable activity of which we see so much today and which did not exist to any such extent in the Spanish-American War, World War I or World War II.

Our country is confused as to the legality or the wisdom of our action and a resolution by the elected representatives of the people recognizing that a state of war exists would eliminate much of this confusion.

With over half a million Americans in deadly combat and our Embassy recently under enemy ground attack, does anyone believe this to be a mere "police action?"

2. We should not commit our Armed Forces abroad unless we are prepared to carry through to victory. Our men should not be asked to sacrifice their lives unless the full power of our Nation is behind them.

General Douglas MacArthur was right: "There is no substitute for victory."

3. Once we are engaged deeply, as in Vietnam, it makes no sense to me to permit the enemy to be supplied with arms, gasoline for his planes and tanks, munitions, trucks, food and other necessities through his ports. The port facilities of Haiphong should be destroyed.

Why this special consideration to the northern Viet Communist regime? We did not "waltz with the Nazi enemy" during World War II.

We should cut the enemy supply lines. We owe this much to a half million Americans and our Vietnam allies.

4. We have compounded our risks, in my judgment, by our weakness during the recent Korean incident. "Face" means much in the Far East as every competent observer knows. We have suffered great "loss of face" as a result of the seizing of our Naval vessel the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its crew of 83 Americans.

During the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, a Moroccan bandit chieftain by the name of Raisuli seized an American citizen by the name of Perdicaris, held him for ransom and threatened to take his life. The American Consul General messaged Secretary of State John Hay. Secretary Hay, after consulting President Teddy Roosevelt sent a short but clear message back. It was: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead!"

Citizen Perdicaris was forthwith released. When the *Pueblo* was seized we should have immediately proceeded to the blockade of Wonsan and other North Korean ports.



No vessels should have been allowed to leave or enter until the *Pueblo* and its crew were back under United States jurisdiction.

At an earlier date in our history Thomas Jefferson wrote a letter to John Jay advocating a strong U.S. Naval force and urged prompt retaliation against any aggressor seizing or harassing U.S. shipping on the high seas.

Speedy retaliation, Jefferson declared, was necessary because—as he put it—"an insult unanswered is the parent of many others."

Jefferson showed that he meant what he said later when he dispatched three U.S. frigates to guard American shipping being harassed by Tunisian pirates.

The men who founded our Republic were very wise. They knew the history of the world up to their time. They knew that when people had lost their freedom, they had lost it because of the concentration of power in the hands of one man in a nation's capital.

To protect us for all future generations they made the Federal Government one of limited and specified powers and reserved all other powers to the States or to the people.

The power of the Federal Government was divided between three co-equal branches named in this order: the legislative, executive and judicial.

When it appeared that the constitutional convention might break up in disagreement, the oldest delegate there, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, rose to his feet and suggested that sessions start with daily prayer.

During his remarks, he said:

"The older I get the more convinced I am that God governs in the affairs of men. If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his knowledge, is it likely that an empire can rise without his aid?"

Our problems at home and abroad are too great to be left to government officials alone. We need the total involvement of all of our people. The great hitherto silent majority as well as the more articulate minorities.

I have great faith in our future and pride in what we have accomplished to date. I know we have problems but most of these can be solved by men and women of good will working together.

None of these problems will be going away. Partial solutions will only be found by our own total involvement (and I stress *total involvement*) in local, State and national affairs.

Nature abhors a vacuum.

If you, and what you represent, do not assume the leadership then the hippies, the beatniks, the advocates of violence, the draft card burners, the "no matter what the issue, my country is wrong" crowd will take over.

No less in our time than in the time of Washington or Lincoln, men must be willing to live for freedom and if necessary to die that it may be gained or preserved.

Are the challenges so great that the private citizen can do nothing to channel the course of events?

When asked this question by a disturbed citizen, President Theodore Roosevelt said that each one should "do what you can, with what you have, where you are."

It is the cumulative effect of such action by a free people that has in the past and will in the future dismay dictators, confound tyrants and tame lawless mobs.

The individual and his company along with local and civic groups can help to lift the smog of defeatism that pervades some people. Certainly there are pockets of economic dislocation where industries have outlived their life span. This has always been so and will continue in a dynamic economy. Carriage makers, blacksmiths, hand type foundries, horse car manufacturers and steam locomotive plants are all but as extinct as the dodo.

It is not being an alarmist but a realist to state that last year we came to the brink of widespread armed insurrection. For the

Presidential election year of 1968, will it get better or worse?

No one can predict with certainty.

What we cannot do is to remain aloof from the scene. No embattled mayor can take the harassment day after day, no thin blue line of a city police force can take the conspiratorial and vicious charge of "police brutality" twelve months a year unless they know the citizenry is behind them and the forces of organized society are determined to preserve law, order and our constitutional form of government.

This basic foundation of a civilized society is not subject to bargaining away or surrendering, in whole or in part.

Our civil rights—among them employment rights—will be better served by cooperation and not by confrontation on the streets.

Every businessman, trade association, chamber of commerce and labor union should be constantly at work to open up new employment opportunities.

Every civil rights organization, church and civic group should be stressing the importance of learning and not burning.

Every individual who would improve his economic position should be seeking ways and means to acquire the skills needed in today's competitive world.

Our problems will not be solved overnight. But solved they will be in expanding business and industry. Solutions will not be found in the fire-blackened ruins of American cities.

If brute power, the torch and the gun in the hands of the mob—black or white—is to overcome or seriously challenge our process of law, then indeed our Nation is facing the greatest crisis since the Civil War.

As citizens we should be talking not of "black power" or "white power"; of "labor power" or "industrial power"—but of *American power*.

We need to use our intellect and our resources for the solution of our economic social and political problems and to keep our defenses strong to act as a shield from a potential overseas enemy who might use a period of domestic turmoil to strike us a fatal atomic blow.

I do have a deep conviction that if we use the same courage and common sense as the men who first gave us the Declaration of Independence and later the Constitution of the United States, there are none of our domestic problems, as large as they may now loom on the horizon, that we cannot solve—if the freedom of choice is left to us—and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

#### MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION RESOLUTION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on February 23, the Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri adopted a resolution asking Congress to investigate the impact of the discontinuances of passenger train service on the welfare and safety of the country.

I call this resolution to the attention of the Commerce Committee and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RESOLUTION, STATE OF MISSOURI, MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Whereas, there have been numerous passenger train discontinuances of recent date; and

Whereas, there are numerous applications for discontinuance of passenger trains now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the various state commissions; and

Whereas, the recent action of the Post

Office Department has materially reduced passenger revenue; and

Whereas, the welfare and safety of this country is being materially injured by such discontinuance; and

Whereas, the Missouri Public Service Commission knows of its own knowledge acquired from several such applications before it and the participation in such hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission that such facts are true;

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the Missouri Public Service Commission joins its sister states in appealing to Congress to call an immediate moratorium on all train discontinuances and to investigate and determine the impact these discontinuances are having on the welfare and safety of our country including its national defense.

This Resolution adopted by the Commission this 23rd day of February, 1968.

WILLIAM A. CLARK,  
Chairman.

Attest:

SAM L. MANLEY,  
Secretary.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

#### INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 705, H.R. 2516.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 705, H.R. 2516, a bill to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, when I last spoke in the Senate in opposition to the pending bill, H.R. 2516, I yielded the floor shortly after I had begun discussion of the constitutional aspects of this question.

It is my considered opinion that the 14th amendment was not designed or intended to be a justification for a penal measure such as the instant bill. It is my opinion also that the 14th amendment should not be construed by a series of liberal interpretations so as to permit something so far from its original purpose and intent as is the bill now under consideration.

We must realize, however, that if Congress approves such a strained interpretation of this amendment as is now

proposed, in so doing it thereby leaves the door open for the Supreme Court to take the position that Congress in its wisdom has seen fit to consider this proposal as "appropriate legislation" under section 5 of the 14th amendment.

Too often in debates I believe that there may be a tendency to feel that if one side or the other can prove that the Supreme Court and lesser courts would approve proposed legislation, then and for that reason it should pass. That is not the real issue that should be considered. The real issue is whether or not it is wise, sound, and good policy to enact proposed legislation and whether it is consistent with our form of government and with the Constitution under which our Government is established.

If, however, the legislative branch feels that a proposal is unconstitutional, then it should not burden the people with it. If it feels that something is technically within the decisions of the Supreme Court but at the same time against our basic concepts and form of government, then Congress would do well not to enact the legislation.

Proposals that may be constitutional technically and at the same time would cause endless misunderstandings, should not be enacted, especially if once Congress has started to legislate in a field there is no logical, fair, or equitable stopping point.

When it is both bad policy and there is doubt about it, constitutionally, as I believe there is here, Congress should not enact the legislation.

Let us go back to Mr. Justice Bradley's words in the *Civil Rights Cases* (109 U.S. 3 (1883)), about it being absurd to think that Congress can do what is proposed here:

It is absurd to affirm that because the rights of life, liberty, and property (which include all civil rights that men have) are by the Amendment sought to be protected against invasion on the part of the State without due process of law, Congress may therefore provide due process of law for their vindication in every case.

In reality the Justice was saying that it is absurd to think that Congress can do what it is now proposed that it should do. A Federal Criminal Code is proposed here that would extend to every "benefit, service, privilege, program, facility, or activity provided or administered by the United States or by any State or subdivision thereof." I refer to page 7, lines 18 through 21 of the pending bill.

This is an attempt to include everything imaginable into one jurisdictional sentence. Moreover, to make matters worse, this is not merely civil jurisdiction, or a bill extending rights; this is a criminal jurisdiction bill—a serious felony bill with up to life imprisonment included in the penalties provided.

This in and of itself brings into play other parts of the Constitution, because, where serious felonies are involved, and trials of major crimes are to be held, every element of the Constitution relating to proper jurisdiction, venue, grand juries, the rights of the accused, the right to trial by jury, the reserved powers of the States—all of these must be considered.

A very mild proposal in comparison

with the instant proposal was before the court when Mr. Justice Bradley stated:

The assumption is certainly unsound. It is repugnant to the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution which declares that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

The statute then before the court dealt with civil rights, public accommodations, and interstate travel, with misdemeanor penalties and a right granted for a civil suit for damages for denial of use or accommodations. Its scope and criminal provisions were insignificant when compared to what is proposed in this bill.

Eight years prior to this utterance by Mr. Justice Bradley, Chief Justice Waite, in the case of *United States v. Cruikshank, et al.* (92 U.S. 542 (1875)), on pages 550 and 551, had said:

The people of the United States resident within any State are subject to two governments, one State and the other national, but there can be no conflict between the two. The powers which one possesses, the other does not. . . . The government of the United States is one of delegated powers alone. Its authority is defined and limited by the Constitution.

Chief Justice Waite made this statement in reversing a conviction based on an indictment under the reconstruction era criminal statute, which is still the main criminal law on so-called civil rights, 18 United States Code 241. It was formerly section 5508 of the Revised Statutes.

Where is the 10th amendment in our deliberations today? Have we forgotten all about it? The gradual encroachment of the Federal Government on the rights of the States has caused both Congress and the Supreme Court to set this amendment more or less aside as though it were obsolete and of no use to the exigencies of the moment. Most of this, however, has been in the field of welfare and large programs of aid by the Federal Government to States and local governing bodies made possible by the broad taxing power of the central Government.

The truth of the matter is that all of the civil rights bills that have been passed in recent years have involved civil and not criminal jurisdiction, except incidentally.

Now, however, the hour has arrived when we are asked to extend Federal criminal jurisdiction to all of the civil rights fields heretofore pronounced, and, more than that, to some fields, such as schools, that the Supreme Court has included in the Federal umbrella of jurisdiction. On top of this we are asked to extend Federal criminal penalties to the activities of all State and local governments.

To say that this is an important bill is a gross understatement. It is so shocking in its scope and in its outright repugnance to the 10th amendment that I am constrained to call it the Federal police state bill.

It has been many years since Congress has considered criminal proceedings in the field of civil rights. I mean by that, regular criminal statutes permitting grand jury proceedings and indictment, if a felony is involved, and criminal trial

in Federal court. This has been for a very good reason, to my way of thinking, and that is that there is a sound hesitancy by both Congress and the courts to extend basic Federal criminal jurisdiction to a field where the police powers of the States extend so clearly to rights of life, liberty, and property.

The various civil rights measures that have been passed by Congress have authorized, in the main, administrative proceedings, injunctions, and use of the civil and equity powers of the Federal courts. Title VI of the civil rights bill of 1964, which authorized the withholding of funds to enforce compliance, is one of the most arbitrary and powerful enforcement measures that has been adopted.

From the criminal law point of view, the present existing statutes authorizing imprisonment for violation of civil rights are 18 U.S.C. 241, and 18 U.S.C. 242. In addition to these laws, section 1509 of the criminal code includes a \$1,000 fine and 1-year maximum penalty for obstruction of Federal court orders by threat or force.

I should like to discuss these statutes. I think that at the same time we should consider briefly their history and perhaps some interesting legislation that was a corollary of the original conspiracy statutes.

The first and foremost existing civil rights criminal statute, 18 U.S.C. 241, dates back directly to the revision of March 4, 1909, and before that to section 5508 of the Revised Statutes, enacted in 1870 and codified in 1873. It is as follows:

SEC. 241. Conspiracy against the rights of citizens.

If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States or because of his having so exercised the same; or

If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured,

They shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, sec. 1, 62 Stat. 696.)

This statute was a Reconstruction period statute. The punishment imposed was a severe one. In fact, as originally passed, it not only carried a 10-year imprisonment and a \$5,000 fine penalty, but contained as well the following penalty language:

And shall, moreover, be thereafter ineligible to any office, or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

The above quoted penalty language was later repealed but the 10-year and \$5,000 fine penalties have remained intact for almost a century. Inasmuch as the present bill would impose a 10-year penalty and a \$10,000 fine, and in case of death, a penalty of life imprisonment, it is difficult to understand the necessity of exceeding the heavy penalties of a strong Reconstruction era statute. The answer would seem to be a desire on the part of the proponents of the bill to take jurisdiction over murder cases. This in itself could change our dual system of govern-



ment and take away from the States a very basic and fundamental traditional right which gave rise to several clauses in our Constitution.

It is most appropriate in this debate that we consider some other and very important legislative history connected with section 241. Immediately following the original section there was another section which was very similar in purpose to the non-Federal or State part of the instant bill. Congress made the mistake in 1870 of doing, in essence, much of what is proposed to be done here. Later in 1909 Congress saw the mistake—the grave error—of what it had done in giving Federal courts jurisdiction over State crimes, and repealed the law. The comparison is pertinent and it should be understood and considered today. I sincerely hope that Congress will not make the same mistake again.

Section 5509 of the Revised Statutes—which next followed what is now 18 U.S.C. 241—provided:

If in the act of violating any provision in either of the two preceding sections any other felony or misdemeanor be committed, the offender shall be punished for the same with such punishment as it attached to such felony or misdemeanor by the laws of the State in which the offense is committed.

In addition to the new section 241, the other section referred to in the above quoted language was a voting rights statute which was later declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

A careful analysis of the language quoted above shows that on its face it represented an attempt by the proponents of a civil rights criminal statute to expand the criminal jurisdiction of U.S. district courts into the field of related State crimes and to follow State law in fixing penalties. A noticeable difference between this law and what is proposed in the instant bill is that the present proposal fixes Federal penalties which in many instances would be in excess of those under State law, but in the case of death would be life imprisonment; whereas, in most States the charge could be murder and the maximum penalty could be death.

A practical interpretation of this statute was that, if in a conspiracy to deprive a person of his civil rights—defined in section 241 as any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States—a State crime were committed, then the Federal courts could take jurisdiction over the State crime and impose the State penalty.

Had this provision of law been in effect last year in the much publicized trial in Mississippi for conspiracy under section 241, then the trial could have been for murder in connection with a conspiracy but nevertheless tried in the Federal court, and the Mississippi penalty for murder could have been imposed.

This illustrates how closely the legislative history of this old statute, which was connected with section 241, is related to the pending bill and should be pertinent in our deliberation.

Who can doubt that there is at least some connection between the instant bill, H.R. 2516, which has its roots in

titles V of the omnibus civil rights bills of 1966 and 1967 and the trials involving assailants of civil rights workers in the South.

The record will show that several murder cases were tried under section 241 and the old statute which I read a moment ago. It will show further that regardless of the merits or demerits of the trial of any particular murder case, and regardless of the justice or injustice therein obtained or meted out, the whole process of giving this type of criminal jurisdiction to the Federal courts was reconsidered in full debate in the Senate in 1908, and section 5509 of the Revised Statutes was repealed—the House of Representatives concurring later—thereby placing the Federal courts back into the sphere of purely Federal jurisdiction where they properly belong.

Senator Augustus Octavius Bacon of Georgia led the fight in the Senate to get this law repealed.

Senator Bacon was born in Bryan County, Ga., October 20, 1839. He attended and graduated from both the undergraduate school and the law school at the University of Georgia at Athens, Ga. He then entered the practice of the law at Atlanta but soon thereafter entered the Confederate Army at the beginning of the War Between the States. He served actively and with distinction in the Confederate Army and was adjutant of the Ninth Georgia Regiment in the Army of Northern Virginia. Subsequently he was commissioned captain in the Provisional Army of the Confederacy and was assigned to general staff duty. After the war, he resumed the practice of law in Macon, Ga. He served for 8 years as speaker of the House of Representatives of Georgia and was president of the Democratic State convention of 1880. In 1894 he was elected as a Democrat to the U.S. Senate and served in the Senate as a distinguished Member of this body until his death in 1914, a period of service of approximately 20 years.

On February 24, 1908, the bill, S. 2982, was pending on the floor of the Senate. It was a bill to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States. The proposed codification included the two 1870 civil rights statutes—now 18 U.S.C. 241 and 18 U.S.C. 242—and the ancillary statute which gave extra or State crime jurisdiction to the Federal courts under section 241.

Senator Bacon proposed an amendment to delete the State criminal jurisdiction statute—Revised Statutes 5509—from the codification, which, of course, was a motion to repeal the statute.

Senator Weldon Brinton Heyburn, Republican from Idaho, opposed the repeal of the statute.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 24, 1908, pages 2386–2391, contains an interesting and pertinent debate on this subject which is quite appropriate for consideration in connection with the instant bill.

I will quote some interesting parts of this debate:

Mr. HEYBURN. I think that goes very far toward meeting the objection urged by the Senator from Georgia and this section invested the United States court with jurisdiction over an offender for an offense against

the State laws. Both the United States Supreme Court and the United States circuit court hold that the offense for which the party can be tried and punished in the United States court is limited to conspiracy, but if the parties are found guilty of the conspiracy they may be punished upon that verdict to the extent that they might be punished for the conspiracy and the crime committed pursuant of it combined. There is nothing unreasonable about that, because it must be that power will be vested somewhere for the punishment of a conspiracy that results in murder. That is one decision upon the question.

There are a great many of these cases coming before the courts even up to the present time—cases entirely different in character from those in contemplation at the time the statute was enacted. It has continually occurred in the jurisprudence of this country that a law enacted to meet an existing condition has been found useful and necessary to meet conditions not even contemplated at the time of the enactment of the law. Therefore, when the question of the continuance of this section in force is up for consideration we must consider not only whether the conditions that called for the enactment of the law exist, but whether other conditions exist that have arisen since, I desire to note in the RECORD in connection with this matter the cases, *In re Lancaster* (137 U.S. 393), *Logan v. United States* (144 US 263), *In re Quarles and Butler* (158 US 532), *Motes v. United States* (178 US 458), and *United States v. Davis* (107 Fed. Rep., 753), all of which are recent cases.

I have here a list of cases that were tried under conditions that were not contemplated by the legislators at the time of the enactment of the law; but this law has proven to be useful and necessary to meet entirely new conditions of a different class from those then contemplated. Now to repeal it would leave no law upon the statute books under which these offenses of more recent origin and practice could be punished . . .

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not know whether it is very profitable for us to discuss this question, because, as the Senator well knows, if we come to a final issue there is no way by which it can be determined. It may very seriously affect the question as to whether or not the bill will ultimately pass; but I do not know that we can determine the question as to whether or not the Senator shall prevail in his contention or whether I shall prevail in mine, because the necessary machinery for that determination is not at hand; but I want to say, in order that the record may be complete, that the Senator misapprehends altogether the point of my objection to the section.

This is not a section which I claim was adapted or designed for a condition of affairs different from that which now exists. I say it is a section which was never a proper section upon the books, and that it is simply a cloak, a device, under which offenses purely against the State law are taken cognizance of by the Federal courts, and under which parties are tried and convicted in the Federal courts when the offense committed is an offense simply against the State. I am going to state this very briefly, because I do not feel any disposition to go into any long argument this afternoon. I did not expect this matter to come up at this time, and I was quite content with the suggestion the Senator himself had made to me that the resumption of the consideration of this bill should not be had until tomorrow. But in order that my point may be made clear, I will read the section preceding this section and then that section in connection with it, to show how utterly useless it is for the purpose of affecting the punishment of anyone who violates the Federal law and how adapted it is to the usurpation of jurisdiction by the Federal courts of an

offense against the State which is not an offense against the Federal authority.

Section 5508 is the one in which there is an offense against the Federal Government set out, and it is in these words:

"If two or more person conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or if two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured"—

There is the offense set out, complete in itself. Here comes the penalty:

"They shall be fined not more than \$5,000 and imprisoned not more than ten years; and shall, moreover, be thereafter ineligible to any office, or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

I think that anyone will agree, whether he is a lawyer or layman, that the offense is set out there and the penalty is attached, making in itself a complete statute, and nothing more is needed to punish for the offense committed against the Federal authority. If there were no other section there would be no trouble in the administration of the law. If nothing followed it nothing more would be required. A party who violated the terms of the statute, as I have read it, could be indicted and tried, and if found guilty could be punished, and no slight punishment either. . . .

Here is this independent section 5509 to which I am objecting:

"If in the act of violating any provision in either of the two preceding sections any other felony"—

Not anything that is a part of that felony, but "any other felony"—

"or misdemeanor be committed, the offender shall be punished for the same with such punishment as is attached to such felony perpetrated in the State, not a part of State in which the offense is committed."

How possibly can it be contended that that section relates to anything except some felony perpetrated in the State, not a part of the original felony? It might have been done in connection with, but it has no office as a part of the original offense.

The law is not ambiguous. It does not leave us in doubt as to whether or not it is an offense which may be properly said to constitute a part of either of the offenses specified in either of the two preceding sections. It says specifically "any other," not a part of the same, but any other offense. . . .

After there has been an assault, possibly, a difficulty between two people, one of whom wants to have a trial in the Federal court, he goes and makes any sort of an allegation about a conspiracy, an afterthought, and a man is dragged a hundred miles from his home, away from his witness, put to great expense and inconvenience, and in a position where it is almost impossible for him properly to defend himself, and carried before a Federal court and tried for an offense which can only properly be tried in a State court.

It is not a slight matter, Mr. President, and I was not speaking lightly when I said in opening my remarks that we might not be able this afternoon, for the lack of proper machinery here, to determine whether this section shall go out or whether it shall remain in the bill. It is a matter of such grave importance that it is one which may put in jeopardy the whole question whether this bill shall receive the sanction of the Senate. I regard it as one of the most important things in this body of laws. I say one of the most important—one of the gravest and most serious, one absolutely unnecessary to the proper administration of the Federal law,

and one of the most serious, which is found in practical operation to give opportunity to usurpation by the Federal courts of jurisdiction in the trial of cases where the offense has been committed against the State and not against the General Government.

Mr. President, I have no desire to delay the Senate with a further argument. I think I have presented it in a way that Senators present can understand the enormity of this thing, and I want to say to the Senator from Idaho that the thing which has impressed this case upon me more seriously than anything else is the very case of Lancaster from which he read. *I was of counsel* in that case, and I know all about it. It was a plain case of murder. The question who committed the murder was a very serious question in the case. But whoever committed it, it was a plain case of murder and a very atrocious case of murder. Parties were dragged a hundred miles from their homes, tried away from their families and their friends, where it was difficult for them to procure witnesses, and where, before any witnesses could be summoned before the court, there had to be reduced to writing a statement of everything it was expected to be proved by that witness, which had to be handed to the prosecuting attorney for him to be ready with a witness to rebut the evidence before it was brought into court. After a trial which lasted for more than thirty days some of the parties were sent to the penitentiary for life and others for terms of years, and after some of them had died in prison and but one remained, President McKinley pardoned that man Lancaster upon the statement of Attorney-General Griggs in writing that upon the record in that case he ought never to have been convicted. The Senator wants illustrations. There is a concrete case which he himself has brought before the Senate; and it is not the only instance in which I have had a practical illustration of the enormity of this law.

Mr. President, if there is anything that is important under our system of Government, it is that parties should be tried in their States for offenses against the State, and that no warping or twisting, with the General Government organized as it was for altogether other purposes, should plain offenses against the State be taken jurisdiction of by the Federal courts. The Federal courts sit at long distances from one another. It is the right of the party to be tried, except in very extraordinary circumstances, by a jury of the vicinage, and he should be tried near the scene of the alleged crime, where he can have the attendance of his witnesses, and it is a hardship and an enormity and an iniquity that a statute so absolutely unnecessary for the maintenance of any Federal interest as this is, should remain upon the statute book by which men can be dragged a hundred miles from their homes to be tried for an ordinary case of violation of the State law.

Mr. President, Senator Bacon made quite a devastating case against this particular section and, as a result, he closed his remarks by saying:

Mr. President, I move to strike out the section.

As a result of his presentation and the motion he made, the section was stricken out and was left out of the codification—in other words, it was repealed.

This may be found at page 2391 of the RECORD of February 24, 1908. The repeal of this statute then became a part of the revision of the penal laws.

I have quoted from the debate at some length because I think that it is pertinent and important.

I agree wholeheartedly with Senator

Bacon that, if there is anything important under our system of government, it is that parties should be tried in their States for offenses against their States, and, that by no warping or twisting of alleged Federal crimes for interference with enjoyment of the privileges of State programs should jurisdiction be given to the Federal Government, organized as it is for altogether other purposes.

It is true that Federal courts in most States sit long distances from one another. It is the right of every party to be tried, except in very extraordinary circumstances, by a jury in the vicinage. He should be tried near the scene of the alleged crime where he can have the attendance of his witnesses. There is no justification to put upon the statute books a proposal to drag men a hundred miles from their homes to be tried for vague alleged interference with someone enjoying the benefits of any Federal, State, or local program in such flagrant violation of our traditions of government.

Mr. President, I could elaborate on this subject much further, but I shall rest for the time being, and yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### GEN. HANFORD MACNIDER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, one of Iowa's most famous sons, Gen. Hanford MacNider, died last Saturday in Sarasota, Fla.

Citizen-soldier, hero, industrialist, civil leader, Government official and patriot—all were labels applied to General MacNider of Mason City, Iowa.

He served with gallantry in both World Wars. He was a national commander of the American Legion. He was an Assistant Secretary of War. He was a Minister to Canada. He was once under serious consideration for both President and Vice President on the Republican ticket.

There are many who considered General MacNider "the greatest citizen soldier in the history of the United States."

As the Des Moines Register put it in an editorial on February 20:

This is not mere comradely hyperbole. General MacNider was in a class by himself as a part-time army officer. This is saying a lot in a country which always has depended upon the citizen militia and reserve officers to provide the bulk of its armed forces in time of war.

I ask unanimous consent that three articles, one entitled "Soldier, Statesman and Civil Leader Dies," from the February 17 issue of the Mason City Globe-Gazette; one entitled "General MacNider—The Later Years," from the Des Moines Sunday Register of February 18, and an editorial entitled "Gen. Hanford MacNider," from the Des Moines



Register of February 20 to be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette, Feb. 17, 1968]

**SOLDIER, STATESMAN AND CIVIC LEADER DIES**  
(By E. A. Norem)

MacNider was born in Mason City Oct. 2, 1889, the only son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. MacNider. He was the third generation of a family that has been part of the life of this community since 1871 when Tom MacNider, the general's grandfather, arrived as a contractor building bridges for the Central of Iowa Railroad—now the M. and St. L. Division of Northwestern railway.

One of the vivid memories of his childhood was the departure of Company A of the 52nd Iowa Infantry, called out for service in the Spanish-American War in 1898. He and other boys and girls followed the outfit down the main street to the Milwaukee station, with the village band blaring and colors flying.

This brought the same kind of a lump to his throat that was to stay with him all the rest of his life on such occasions and was to be duplicated almost exactly 55 years later when at Camp McCoy in 1953 as the retiring major general of the line he took the last review of his Army Reserve division, the 103rd.

Between those years a tremendous amount of action and achievement, both in the military and civilian efforts, became a part of his life.

**NO WEST POINT**

In 1903—at the age of 14 years—he was enrolled at Milton Military Academy in Massachusetts, where he was graduated in 1907. At this time he was offered a non-competitive appointment to West Point, but his parents would have nothing to do with such ideas. According to the accepted family schedule he was to attend Harvard, after which he was to go into the family bank, the First National of Mason City.

He finished college in three years. He had played freshman football and was slated for the varsity team, but an injury prevented participation in football after the first year.

One summer he made a trip across the ocean on a cattle boat and an extended tour of Europe on a motorcycle. Upon being graduated in 1911, he received a trip around the world with some of his classmates. He then went into his father's bank, starting as bookkeeper and later becoming teller and assistant cashier.

In 1916, when World War I was already well under way in Europe, he signed up as an ambulance driver with the French Army without notifying his parents. But his father suffered a stroke on the very day he had expected to announce his intentions. The family doctor told him if he wanted to kill his father the thing to do was to carry out his plans.

By this time he was second lieutenant of Company A of the National Guard after having served as chairman of a committee to solicit funds for an armory. That summer he spent his vacation at one of the first civilian military training camps at Ft. Sheridan and became first lieutenant of his company, which shortly afterwards was called to Mexican border service.

**MEXICAN BORDER**

"For the Iowa troops, the border assignment was a military holiday of the first order," the general wrote about it afterwards. After nine months of service the 2nd Iowa, of which Company A was a unit, was mustered out March 23, 1917, at Fort Des Moines.

On the following April 6, the United States entered World War I and on May 15 of that year MacNider was admitted to the first officers training camp at Ft. Snelling, Minn.

Commissioned a second lieutenant, he was assigned to the infantry and later transferred to the 9th Infantry, 2nd Division, with which he sailed to France Sept. 7, 1917, for service with the American Expeditionary Forces.

In France MacNider was assigned to the first corps school, designed to teach Americans French methods of warfare. He had this assignment Oct. 22 to Nov. 30, 1917. He was named instructor in the army candidates school in the walled city of Langres, France, Dec. 15, 1917.

He was halfway through the training of a second class when he, eager to get into combat duty, "went over the hill" to join his own old command May 15, 1918. He had the excuse that his War Department orders read that he was assigned to the 9th Infantry and that no one had the right to separate him from it for any other duty.

**IN FRANCE**

When, after several days of wandering back of the French front he finally found his old regimental headquarters he reported without orders, pretty well scared by this time over his infraction of Army rules and regulations. The regiment, however, was sorely short of officers and even a stray second lieutenant was welcome. He was given the assignment of regimental adjutant, despite his protest he wanted to return to his platoon.

The day after he joined the regiment, it marched down the road to Chateau Thierry to help stop the last desperate drive of the Germans toward Paris.

In the months that followed his joining his combat division, MacNider distinguished himself to the extent that he became one of the most decorated officers of the war. He was promoted to first lieutenant in May and captain in July 1918, at which time he was made regimental adjutant. As such he served in the Aisne defensive, Aisne-Marne offensive, Marbach and Limey defensive sectors and the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensive.

**WOUNDED IN ACTION**

Capt. MacNider was wounded in action Sept. 12, 1918, in the St. Mihiel engagement. Oct. 17, 1918, he was promoted to major. Oct. 27, 1918, he was assigned as division adjutant of the 2nd Division and was stationed in Germany until the latter part of July 1919.

He was promoted to lieutenant colonel May 19, 1919, and on Sept. 9, 1919, at Camp Travis, Tex., he concluded his service with the acceptance of his resignation by the President.

MacNider accepted an appointment as lieutenant-colonel, Infantry Officers Reserve Corps, Nov. 15, 1919, and as colonel in that corps July 27, 1922, which commission he held during the period in 1926 and 1927 when he was serving as Assistant Secretary of War under Secretary Dwight C. Davis and President Coolidge.

After the war MacNider returned to his home and assumed the lead in forming an American Legion post, Clausen-Worden 101, of which he was the first commander. He leaped into the national limelight by taking a vigorous part in the Minneapolis and Cleveland national conventions in 1919 and 1920.

MacNider nominated Col. Matt Tinley for state commander of the American Legion in 1919 and was himself elected vice commander. As vice commander he did a large amount of organization work in the state which he continued when he was elected state commander the next year.

At Kansas City in 1921 he was put into nomination for the national commandship by Dan Steck, later U.S. Senator. He was elected by acclamation.

When MacNider handed the national commander's gavel to his successor at the 1922

convention in New Orleans, he had averaged more than three appearances on public platforms a day throughout the 12 months, usually all in different towns and cities and in every state. He continued to insist that the national organization adopt the "Iowa idea," of community service which made it mandatory that every post of the Legion make some unselfish contribution to its community welfare each year or lose its charter, a program he said "to make the Legion in Iowa an integral and worthwhile part of Iowa life."

**ORGANIZES BANK**

Home again in late 1922 after a half dozen years out of civilian pursuits, MacNider organized an investment affiliate of the First National Bank, of which his father was president.

He served as vice president of the bank and as director in the Northwestern States Portland Cement Co., of which his father was president and general manager. He also took active part in organization work of the Republican party.

Feb. 20, 1925, he was married to Margaret McAuley, also a native of Mason City. Soon after the wedding he was summoned to Washington by President Coolidge to become Assistant Secretary of War in charge of industrial mobilization.

So well did industry cooperate with his efforts that in an address at Chattanooga, Tenn., in October 1927 MacNider declared that if the new mobilization plans had been in effect at the time of World War I the war would have cost the United States only half the amount it did.

His agreement was to serve one year, but the President persuaded him to stay until early 1928, when he was succeeded by Col. Burton Robbins of Cedar Rapids, whose appointment he had suggested.

During those Washington years he served as Acting Secretary of War a great part of the time, attending cabinet meetings, inspecting all the larger Army installations, making hundreds of talks over the country and putting the industrial mobilization structure on as permanent a basis as possible. He flew 50,000 miles by airplane, many times with inexperienced cadet pilots.

Two sons, Tom and Jack, were born to the MacNiders while he served as Assistant Secretary of War. A third son, Angus, was born shortly after the family returned from a trip overseas in 1928.

On Oct. 30, 1928, Charles H. MacNider died suddenly in his office at the First National Bank. The son took over the management of the affairs of the family. He immediately became chairman of the board of the bank and a year later, after purchasing a large stock holding, and receiving other backing, assumed his father's place as president and general manager of the Northwestern States Portland Cement Co.

**BANCORPORATION**

Soon afterwards the First National Bank, with the Northwestern National Bank of Minneapolis and other banking institutions formed the Northwest Bancorporation, which was soon expanded to take over a hundred banks in Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, the Dakotas and Montana. As a vice president and director of this new enterprise, MacNider put considerable effort into its organization and management.

In May 1930, MacNider was again called to Washington where he was asked by President Hoover to serve as Minister to Canada for the drafting of a treaty on the St. Lawrence Waterway. MacNider agreed to take the appointment if not more than six months' service was involved.

The Senate approved the appointment and, in June 1930, MacNider and his family journeyed to Ottawa, where he presented his credentials to the Governor General, the Earl of Willington.

It was two years later before the Canadian

government agreed that if the United States would approve the necessary treaty, it would go along. The treaty was signed in Washington in 1932 and President Hoover immediately submitted it to the Senate for its approval.

On their journey back to Canada, the prime minister, the Canadian minister to Washington and MacNider were awarded honorary Doctor of Law degrees by Syracuse University. With the big mission completed the MacNiders returned home. The seaway treaty, however, ran into rough weather in the Senate. It was not until 1953 when Canada threatened to complete the waterway as an all-Canadian project that Congress finally agreed to go along.

#### WORLD WAR II

At the American Legion's national convention at Milwaukee in 1941, less than two months before Pearl Harbor, the convention had before it a resolution endorsing a national policy of "all aid short of war," which MacNider indicted as "national hypocrisy."

MacNider told his fellow Legionnaires:

"I want this convention to have the guts to say what it means. If this is our war, let's go in. If it isn't our war, let's stay out."

"I hope I never hear again that we are cringing behind the British Navy while somebody else is fighting our war. The President should ask Congress for a declaration of war. If Congress thinks that the proper course, it can declare war. Then you and I will march out again to lick the enemies of our country."

When the call came a few weeks later with the attack on Pearl Harbor Dec. 7, 1941, MacNider marched. He immediately wired President Roosevelt, offering his services. He was ordered to Australia with the first contingent shipping out of New York Jan. 23, 1942.

MacNider's first task was to direct reception of shipping bringing troops and material for the Southwest Pacific Operations. Upon Gen. MacArthur's arrival from the Philippines, MacNider was promoted to brigadier general and assigned to command the first American infantry contingents, whose job it was to drive the Japs out of New Guinea. These contingents were the 126th, 127th and 128th Regiments of the 32nd Division.

#### JUNGLE FIGHTER

In September 1942, MacNider commanded the 128th Task Force in the first airborne troop movement, flown across the New Guinea mountains to Wanigela. With little equipment the outfit marched and fought for weeks through the jungle and swamps in searing tropical heat to take part in the Buna campaign.

Landing in luggers three miles from Buna, the 128th hit the Japs at Endalere on Nov. 18. On the third day of the American advance some thousands of yards from its objective, MacNider, up in the forefront of the attack to encourage and steady the troops, caught some 11 fragments of a Japanese grenade. This made him the first American general officer to be wounded in combat in World War II.

He turned over his command when doctors ordered him flown to Brisbane on the Australian mainland for operations and hospitalization.

While recovering he was given administrative assignments which made him unhappy. He was then stationed at Port Moresby and Milne Bay in New Guinea, in charge of the Combined Operations Service Command, acting as the first designated co-ordinator of the Australian and American forces in the allocation of shipping and supplies.

His opportunity to go with combat troops again came in early 1944 when he was given the assignment as Deputy Commander, United States Forces in the Admiralties, and attached to the 1st Cavalry Division.

He was second in command over the 50,000 Army and Navy, engineer and construction

troops whose job it was to drive out the Jap garrison and establish a naval and air base on Los Negros and Manus Islands.

#### WOUNDED AGAIN

By this time a tiny fragment of the grenade that had lodged in his eye at the time he was wounded began to give him trouble, flaring into infection. He was rushed to New York for a series of operations. Still bandaged, he flew to the Pacific coast with his mother, wife and youngest son to wish Godspeed to his second son, Jack, who a Marine of 17, was being shipped to Hawaii.

Tom, the eldest son, an air cadet at 18, joined them on furlough from his California station. Angus on his 17th birthday, joined the Navy and went into training at Great Lakes while his father flew back to Australia. The time was August 1944.

MacNider was immediately given command of the 158th Regimental Combat Team, then stationed in Noemfoor Island, Dutch Guinea. The Combat Team was larger than a division with its 30,000 men, who not only did the fighting but also handled the supplies. He also was in command of the 503rd Paratroop Regiment.

Jan. 11, 1945, the outfit stormed ashore in what was Gen. MacNider's first participation in an assault landing from the sea. The assault was on Mabiloa, on Lingayen Gulf, on the west shore of Luzon, the big island of the Philippines which had remained in the hands of the Japanese since the fall of Bataan.

The Bushmasters, as the Combat Team was called, got the worst of the fighting, being on the left flank of Gen. Walter Krueger's 6th Army, hottest sector of the campaign. MacNider's forces, now augmented by two additional Infantry regiments, fought its way over the mountainous ranges inland, securing the west Luzon coast against the Japanese forces, now withdrawing to the north.

The Bushmasters later ranged across Luzon to capture the important seaports of Batangas and Legaspi and to clean up the strategic Bicol Peninsula.

#### DISDAINED FOXHOLE

During the campaign the GI's often saw Gen. MacNider up front, driving his own jeep, disdaining foxholes when the going was rough and frequently leaving his aide behind because he didn't want anyone "to get hurt."

To other officers, this utter disdain of danger was a constant cause of concern. They told about the time the men dashed for foxholes during the bombardment and left a whining dog with him in his headquarters building. "Somebody come and get this dog," he yelled. "I can't sleep with him howling in here."

On June 30, 1945, the Luzon campaign and with it the Bicol operation was officially terminated. With the Philippines in American hands, the 158th began training for the D-2 landings on the southern islands of Japan. In addition, MacNider forces were charged with the creation and training of a full brigade of Philippine infantry to be recruited from the scattered guerrilla troops.

VJ-Day came in August with the result that all these projects were discontinued. MacNider was flown to Japan to make arrangements for the newly assigned occupation area for his troops close to the great shrine of Nikko.

MacNider spent a brief period in occupied Japan, after which he arrived home the latter part of October. With him was his son, Jack, who fought with the 5th Marines on Iwo Jima. They had met in Japan as the American armies converged for the occupation.

Released to inactive duty Feb. 8, 1946, Gen. MacNider on the following Aug. 19 became the commanding general of the 103rd Infantry Division of the Reserves and on

March 31, 1949, was promoted to major general. His retirement came on his 62nd birthday, Oct. 2, 1951.

At this last encampment at Camp McCoy, Wis., in the summer of 1951, the general told his men:

"Old soldiers never die, but all the young ones wish they would."

Aug. 8, 1956, President Eisenhower signed a congressional measure that advanced him from major general to lieutenant general. It was the first time that an officer in the reserves had achieved a higher rank than major general.

The general now devoted his time and energies to the job of remodeling and enlarging the Northwestern States Portland Cement Co., of which he was president and general manager, and to many other duties connected with private and public interests. He was a trustee of the Equitable Life Insurance Co. of Iowa.

In the spring of 1946 he was elected an overseer of Harvard College and the next half dozen years he served as chairman of the university's geological and military affairs. MacNider served as honorary chairman of the committees in charge of Mason City's centennial celebration in 1953.

In the spring of 1962 another honor came to the general. He was given an Honorary Doctor of Laws degree at Simpson College, Indianola, the only Iowa institution to bestow this honor upon him.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Feb. 18, 1968]

#### GENERAL MACNIDER—THE LATER YEARS

(NOTE.—Register writer James Flansburg spent several days with Hanford MacNider in the summer of 1965. His account of MacNider in his later years touches on the warm and nostalgic traits of a great Iowan and great American.)

(By James Flansburg)

The general—as everyone called him—reminded one of a very-proper Bostonian, who could cuss like a sergeant.

He had little time for small talk, but when he described his boyhood in Mason City his ramrod carriage became straighter, his blue eyes flashed and his rumbling voice made him seem no more than 30.

His long list of military decorations showed a zest for fighting. Where had it come from?

"I don't like fighting," he said, and then paused to light a Fatima cigarette, the brand he began smoking when he was on the Mexican border in 1913.

"But I suppose it had something to do with when the youngsters from the south side—where the railroad shops were—decided to fight, they hunted up the banker's son."

It was from Mason City, "where we had a small Balkan war every night," that young MacNider was sent east to prep school and then to Harvard, where he finished in three years but stayed on a year to take his degree with the class of 1911.

His companions there were John Reed, who later became one of the heroes of the Russian revolution, and Waldo Peirce, who became a prominent artist. If he knew Walter Lippmann of that class of 1910, he never volunteered it. Had he had asked he no doubt would have called Lippmann "that red fellow."

General MacNider's political views are reflected when he talked about his friend, Republican Henry Cabot Lodge, taking a post with the Johnson administration:

"I've told Cabot several times he ought to give up this play-acting and run as a Democrat."

Although he served in several high government posts, and was quite influential, he contended that he didn't like politics: "I can't compromise with these people."

His views were sharp. Dwight D. Eisenhower was a major on the staff of Assistant



Secretary of War MacNider: "He was one hell of a nice guy and a genius for getting people to work together."

He was assistant secretary under President Calvin Coolidge: "Silent Cal, hell, he'd talk your leg off once he was sure you didn't want anything."

As a businessman, MacNider increased the family's holdings several times—probably at least \$10 million—and he and Mrs. MacNider, during the summers in Mason City, lived in a style that recalls the 1890's.

They did close 27 of the 50 rooms of the family home, Indianhead, but it still took a substantial staff to run it.

One sunny morning, in his pajamas, dressing robe and lap robe, he greeted a guest at Indianhead.

"I look like General Grant writing his memoirs," he said.

He delighted in joking about himself. His impression of himself on a television interview (where in 40 minutes only two "hells" slipped in): "I looked like a newly unwrapped mummy, Ramesses the Second."

His serious moments commanded attention. Once, over his pre-luncheon glass of Irish stout, he said: "No, I won't let them hunt pheasants on my land. I hate killing."

No one at the table—at the Euchre and Cycle Club on the top floor of the Hotel Hanford—could think of anything to say. "I hate war," added the general after about a minute's silence.

In later years, Mrs. MacNider planned his day. He liked it and he smiled warmly when she jumped into one conversation: "Do you remember when we used to have liquor permit books to buy liquor?" she asked. "Well, I've never had a drink in my life, but I had to do the buying because he was afraid his mother would see him coming out of the liquor store."

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Feb. 20, 1968]

#### GEN. HANFORD MACNIDER

Gen. Hanford MacNider of Mason City, who died at 78 in Florida last weekend, was one of Iowa's most distinguished citizens, as businessman, soldier and diplomat. He was best known and will be best remembered for his exploits as a soldier in both world wars.

He was one of the most decorated heroes of World War I, with medals for bravery from several allied countries as well as a chestful from his own nation. His fame as a soldier and his leadership ability led to his election as national commander of the American Legion in 1921. He was prominent in the leadership of the American Legion during the years of its greatest political strength between the great wars.

General MacNider was an important figure in the Republican party, and he was a serious candidate for the nomination for vice-president in 1932. He had been assistant secretary of war in the Coolidge Administration from 1925 to 1928 and minister to Canada in the Hoover Administration.

The general also was a national leader in business circles. He organized and managed the Northwestern States Portland Cement Co. and was instrumental in setting up one of the Nation's large bank holding companies, the Northwest Bancorporation.

Still, it was as a military figure that he made his mark in history. Ray Murphy, a former Iowan and himself a former national commander of the American Legion, said he considered MacNider "the greatest citizen soldier in the history of the United States." This is not mere comradely hyperbole. General MacNider was in a class by himself as a part-time army officer. This is saying a lot in a country which always has depended upon the citizen militia and reserve officers to provide the bulk of its armed forces in time of war.

Although he was in his fifties when the U.S. entered World War II, MacNider insisted

upon getting into the thick of the fighting in the southwest Pacific. He was a front-line battle commander, and a cracking good one, too. He could well have rested on his honors from World War I or have put his talents to use in less hazardous ways.

Iowans will long honor his memory.

#### "MAKE NO MISTAKE, AMERICA IS FIGHTING FOR US"—ARTICLE BY BERNARD LEVIN, OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the February 26 issue of U.S. News & World Report, the lead editorial is entitled "Make No Mistake, America Is Fighting for Us," and is a reprint of an article by Bernard Levin, widely known writer and TV commentator in Great Britain, reproduced from the London Daily Mail of February 1, 1968.

If there is anyone who has any doubts about the reason why the United States should be supported in its position in the Vietnam war, he ought to read this article by one of our neighbors across the Atlantic Ocean. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### "MAKE NO MISTAKE, AMERICA IS FIGHTING FOR US"

(By Bernard Levin)

I spent yesterday evening at the opera (Wagner, of course). You, I dare say, spent it helping your children with their homework, or watching television, or learning the piano, or reading a book.

A lot of Americans and South Vietnamese, however, spent it dying. Strange to relate (and I imagine that many of them would find it as strange as anyone), they spent it dying so that you can go on watching television, learning the piano, reading books and helping the children with their homework, and so that I can go on listening to Wagner.

I don't know about you, but I am grateful, and will now say why. A battle was launched in Vietnam on Tuesday, in which bands of North Vietnamese and Viet Cong swept through South Vietnamese towns, killing and pillaging, while others launched a major offensive against the American base at Khe Sanh.

It is not, I believe, too fanciful to describe the battle as potentially one of the major turning-points of civilisation, and to think of General Westmoreland and his men in the way that, with the perspective of history to aid us, we think of Leonidas and the Spartans at Thermopylae, John Sobieski facing the Turks at the gates of Vienna, or Lord Dowding and Fighter Command in the Battle of Britain. For each of those battles changed the face of the world for the better; or rather, prevented others from changing it for the worse.

And so it may be at this moment in Vietnam. The war there is confused and horrible; its aims blurred, its methods savage, its cost in innocent blood uncountable.

But if it is lost, if the Americans finally get tired of doing the world's work for nothing but the world's abuse, if South Vietnam is left to its fate, then what will follow is not merely the piecemeal engulfing of the rest of South-East Asia. What will follow, as surely as Austria followed the Rhineland, and Czechoslovakia followed Austria, and Poland followed Czechoslovakia, and six years of world war followed Poland, is a nuclear confrontation on a global scale between the forces at present engaged in one tiny corner of the globe.

And that, in the end, is why my Wagner and your children are at stake this day in "a

far-off country of which we know nothing." The Americans are not fighting the war there so that Saigon racketeers can grow fat on black market profits; indeed, they are only secondarily fighting it so that Saigon may stay free long enough for a society to grow up there that will be strong enough to dispense with the racketeers.

They are not even there because if they leave they will one day be digging gun emplacements in California, as the Australians will be digging them round Darwin.

They are there because they know that, where aggression is concerned, the appetite doth grow by what it feeds on; and because they therefore know that, however great the price of the war in Vietnam, it is still less than would be the price of the war we will all one day have to fight elsewhere if it is lost.

The Americans and the South Vietnamese are not alone in knowing this. The Australians and New Zealanders know it; the Thais know it; the South Koreans know it; the Filipinos know it. But in this country, it seems, we do not know it.

Well, it is time we did. And the battle now going on in Vietnam is as good a time to find out as we shall ever have. On this battle, the Communist forces have staked a great deal; for some time now they have been promising their increasingly disillusioned troops that one last push will see victory—if not military victory, then "victory-by-coalition."

The Communist strategy in Vietnam is to inflict such a major reverse on the Americans and South Vietnamese that they will be desperate to make peace even at the price of an agreement that gives the Communists a share in the Government of South Vietnam, with the full take-over following a few months later.

I do not think that the American resolve will crack. But a word of thanks and admiration from Britain may help to show America that her resolve is recognised for what it is—a resolve to hold the front for civilisation, by convincing those who would destroy it that they are not going to succeed in doing so.

I would prefer our thanks to come from our Government. Unfortunately, it won't. Nor will it even come from our Opposition. So it has to come from us—from those of us who recognise the connection between what the Americans are doing in South Vietnam and what we like to do with our evenings in Britain.

We are not, I believe, all that few. But few or many, let me now say on behalf of us all, to the Americans and South Vietnamese and their allies, even now fighting and dying in Vietnam:

"Our words may be useless, but they are all we have to offer. We understand why you are there, and know that your cause is ours too. And we thank you."

#### IOWA MISSIONARIES DODGE SHELLS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, much has been written on the grand strategy, the big battles being waged in South Vietnam.

Too little has been written on the faceless little guy, the soldier who is carrying the burden of the fighting in that far-off nation.

Ernie Zaugg, a special correspondent for the Des Moines Register, is one of those who knows the burdens of the average soldier. Each week he attempts to bring to the readers of the Register what this soldier is going through in Vietnam.

His article in the Sunday Register of February 18 is an example of his reporting, and I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Iowa Missionaries Dodge Shells," be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IOWA MISSIONARIES DODGE SHELLS  
(By Ernie Zaugg)

HUE, VIETNAM.—I met Pfc. Jim Glynn, whose father has a farm near Anita, Ia., in the garden of the chief of the province which had become the headquarters of the 2nd Battalion 5th Regiment of the United States Marines.

With his 106-millimeter recoilless rifle he made picturesque ruins of many buildings, punching holes in their sides and routing out the Viet Cong, who have a great fear of this formidable weapon.

Any American who sees these Marines street fighting in Hue, must be filled with pride. They are mere boys with hardly a fluff on their chin.

They could be working as clerks in a bank, in the stacks of a library or behind a soda fountain, but they fight from street to street with the stoic toughness of veterans and not rarely with a sort of grim humor.

I met S/Sgt. Eugene Martin, 216 S. Birchwood ave., Davenport, Ia., at the chopper pad in the center of our perimeter in Hue.

He was there by accident, having accompanied some tanks alone Route 1 to embark them for the DMZ from the river point.

He got into the midst of the battle and had to fight his way into Hue and stay there to help out.

On Feb. 5 there were reported seven wounded Marines in Hue, but conditions for flying were so wretched that only volunteer pilots could go to get them.

Capt. Ernest Kun, who had a football scholarship at Iowa State and was graduated in 1965, went.

He was guided in by radar. The radar scope could even spot the buildings around their landing zone.

It was 9 p.m., pitch dark and foggy. Three times they came down in the area of the landing zone, but without seeing it. Fifty-caliber enemy fire came their way and one round knocked a hole in the roof after glancing off the machine-gun.

The fourth time they made it, but were lower than the buildings around the landing zone and had to hop over them. They rescued 17 wounded Marines instead of seven. Half of them would not have lived out the night.

The complicated machinery which made this feat possible is incomprehensible to the layman, but not to Cpl. Bill Moore, 503 West Monroe st., Fairfield, Ia., who keeps it working.

His field is Avionics Radio Communication. The method of approaching Hue is called Ground Control Approach with radar vector.

ROOSEVELT GRADUATE

Capt. Michael Montgomery, a graduate of Des Moines Roosevelt High with a B.A. in American history from Iowa State University (class of 1964), has made much progress in the mysteries of this political-social war.

He is in charge of selecting and training defectors from the Viet Cong as scouts for the Marines. They are called Kit Carson scouts. He has 96 of them.

Twenty of his scouts were with their families in Hue when the Viet Cong struck on Jan. 30, the beginning of the Vietnamese New Year holiday, Tet.

Our chief instrument for grappling with the social-political side of the war is a State Department agency called CORDS (Civil Office for Revolutionary Development Support).

Its job is to help the Vietnamese government help the people in agriculture, political instruction, administration, refugee problems, employment and the many other ways in which a government serves the people.

Mr. and Mrs. Harlan Hochstettler, sponsored by Protestant Church groups in the

states and working with CORDS, were advisers at a Vocational Training Center for refugees in Hue.

Harlan Hochstettler graduated from the Iowa Mennonite High near Kalona, Ia., where his mother lives.

The Hochstettlers and five other idealistic young Americans, Mennonites and Lutherans, who worked at the same institute were living in a house a mile from our military compound in Hue when the Viet Cong attacked.

For some reason the Viet Cong did not try to enter their house at all, though they must have known of them as there were American cars parked in front of the house.

ANXIOUS DAYS

These beleaguered refugee workers from Iowa and Pennsylvania had anxious days. They rationed their food and did their best to occupy their minds and came out of it all right. When troops of the 2nd battalion 5th regiment finally arrived and drove the Viet Cong away, they were happy.

I met them at the pier on the River of Perfumes waiting for an LCU cargo craft to take them down the river.

Though badly shaken, these idealistic and religious young people, who might be pacifists and non-participants in ordinary warfare, are dedicated to their humane work of teaching and helping, which is so important in this kind of a war.

A few mortar rounds plunked near our gun boats on the river and wild sniper rounds came zipping into the landing zone area and we all took cover. Mrs. Hochstettler under a water buffalo, an iron tank on wheels used for drink water.

SP4C. MARK A. WHITE RECEIVES  
DEFENDER OF FREEDOM AWARD

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, last week, Sp4c. Mark A. White, of Creston, Iowa, received the top award in the "Letters From Armed Forces Personnel" category of the Freedoms Foundation.

This is a singular award, presented for an expression of faith in the United States.

Specialist White knows the meaning of America as he so well spelled it out in a letter to his parents.

I know I'm young—

He wrote—

too young even to vote for my ultimate commander-in-chief, but Mom, how old must a guy be before he can realize the importance of freedom, patriotism and trust? It's not an Army of youth-blinded teenagers over here but rather a force body of men, striving for what we believe in and wish to perpetuate for our future wives and children.

I think his letter merits attention, especially in these days when patriotism is being questioned so strongly. I ask unanimous consent that Specialist White's letter be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM: MY HERITAGE, MY RESPONSIBILITY

DEAREST MOM AND DAD: Well, here I sit with finally a minute I've stolen just for you. I have some pretty important things that need to be done but I felt your letter definitely required a prompt answer. It's good to receive your letters—it happens so infrequently—with mail all messed up—but I was pretty upset after reading this one.

Mom, I must explain this war to you so maybe you can understand why I'm here. I think Dad realizes the importance of my being here, having faced a similar situation twenty-four years ago. I know I'm young, too

young even to vote for my ultimate commander-in-chief, but Mom, how old must a guy be before he can realize the importance of freedom, patriotism, and trust? It's not an Army of youth-blinded, teenagers over here but rather a force body of men, striving for what we believe in and wish to perpetuate for our future wives and children.

When you are faced with the hunger-dulled eyes and pencil-thin limbs of mere babies, enslaved to a life predestined to submediocrity under dictatorship and strife, suddenly your eyes are opened and you can really appreciate your own childhood. Along with the broad tree-lined avenues, the glittering blinking lights of towns of home, there's a basic core on which our American society is founded and rises high among the nations of the world. Freedom, opportunity, trust, and yes, even love for our fellow men makes our United States truly united. Through the now riot-torn sections of towns flows a demand for change and improvement which will follow, for ours is an ever progressing society, striving towards a more complete union.

I guess maybe, Mom, this will help you to understand that I've changed and aged just a little. Although my hair isn't streaked with gray yet, my eyes have peered into the roof of existence and my thoughts matured. I can now fully appreciate a big green yard full of swings and toys better than any eight or ten year old kid. Yet I'll stand up and speak my mind and vote as a true adult when the time arrives. And I can thank the Lord for giving me the opportunity to learn this lesson while I'm young enough to do something about retaining our way of life.

Don't feel badly, folks, worrying does nothing to help me. All you can really do for me is be good citizens and combat the pressures that attack our country from within. If our unity is destroyed, our nation is destroyed.

I must close now—the sergeant has told us to pack our gear to move. I don't know when or where I'll have the chance to receive another of your letters, or answer if I do, but keep writing and keep the faith. Mom. That's what I ask of you. No matter what happens now, your baby will never come home again.

Your loving son,

MARK ALAN.

WHAT CHEER, IOWA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a few years ago, on the Senate floor, I asked the question: "What ever happened to Saturday night?"

The purpose was to remind people that, in this age of urbanization, this era of space, we could not afford to ignore or overlook the small town, from which has come the greatness which is America's.

I said the small town still has a place in this Nation despite the continued emphasis on "bigness." I hoped that we, as a nation, would remember and seek, where possible, to return to the small town atmosphere, where the "Saturday night" was a time to renew and reexamine our sense of values, an opportunity to strengthen our knowledge and trust of our neighbor.

It was my contention that if this could be regained, even in a small way, the mistrust which pervades this modern age will also become a thing of the past.

I also noted that there are small towns which defy the notion that they should not exist.

Such a town is What Cheer, Iowa. While the population is small—only 956—the town has no intention of dying. And



there are many such towns not only in Iowa but across the Nation.

The story of What Cheer is the story of many others.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the February 18 picture magazine section of the Des Moines Sunday Register be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CHEER (POPULATION 956) SWINGS AGAIN  
(By Onelta Fisher)

Several nationally known big name bands have played the What Cheer opera house in the last 14 months. Guy Lombardo has been there twice; Sammy Kaye, Wayne King, Jan Garber and Fred Waring have entertained standing room only crowds. The Old Gold Singers, Penn College Players, country music and variety programs have packed the house. Why?

Fred Waring put it into words for William Wagner, Des Moines architect who supervises restoration work on the 74-year-old building. Fred said, "Thousands of people have appeared on this stage. Something of their performances lingers here. There's a warm feeling of being with your audience that I've never known in any other place."

Waring must have meant every word; his Pennsylvanians played the longest concert in their career—half an hour beyond the 10:30 finish announced in the programs. As for that warm feeling, Sammy Kaye will vouch for it. Kaye's band played What Cheer July 4, 1966. The building is not yet air-conditioned but dauntless opera house boosters found a large fan in the basement and set it to play over tubs full of ice. When you entered the auditorium, it seemed pleasantly cool. In the end, it wasn't the heat that made the evening one to remember; it was the humidity. But the band played on.

BECAUSE THERE WERE TOO MANY PETERSBURGS

That's the story of What Cheer's Masonic Opera House, and of the community as a whole. Five major fires and at least eight destructive floods have hit the town. The first big fire, in 1890, took 28 homes and 20 business places. While the ruins still smoldered, desks were set up in undamaged stores where accounts receivable could be paid to the burned-out merchants.

In 1876, "Doc" Thomas watched flooded Coal Creek carry his grocery store downstream. When the next flood came two years later, Doc opened the doors and let the water flow through.

That's What Cheer. Unsinkable.

Few of Iowa's small towns are historically more interesting than What Cheer, population 956. The first settlers staked claims along exposed coal banks, including one Peter Britton who came from England in 1855. Pioneers crossing the prairies sometimes came upon a signpost pointing "To the Coal Banks," the site of Peter Britton's shanty settlement. It came to be known as Petersburg, later, What Cheer, because Joseph Andrews, another pioneer, said there already were too many Petersburgs.

"What Cheer" derives from an old form of English greeting used much as we ask, "How are you?" Many early arrivals were miners from the British Isles, giving credence to the origin.

With a seemingly inexhaustible supply of coal and an insatiable demand, mining became big business for What Cheer. In 1882, slope, shaft and strip mines in Keokuk County produced 16.3 per cent of the coal mined in Iowa.

An estimated 1,000 men were employed; the payroll was \$80,000 to \$100,000 every two weeks, and most of it was spent in What Cheer. Seventy to 100 mines of varying sizes have operated in the area, mines with romantic sounding names like Rosetta, Klon-

dike, Little Star and Black Diamond. On the other side of the track were the Soup-bone, across from the slaughterhouse, and the Pity Me, where men often were laid off because of flooded pits.

THE "BUMBLE BEE" AND "PUNKIN VINE"

Eight mining camps around What Cheer brought the trading area population to 7,000 or more. The camps were often company owned, cheerless places laid out along cinder paths. As many as 20 saloons provided "cheer." Beer came to the railroad icehouses in carload lots. Families locked their doors so men wouldn't enter the wrong box-like house on the way home at night.

Trains puffed and rumbled through town day and night. The Burlington, Cedar Rapids and Northern (BCR&N) came to What Cheer in 1879-80. The North Western built a winding branch from Belle Plaine, known as the "Punkin Vine." The Rock Island's "Bumble Bee" carried passengers.

In 1958, the Interstate Commerce Commission authorized abandonment of the one remaining stretch of North Western line. After the last string of empties pulled out, a rail was removed from the track signifying official abandonment.

A plentiful supply of fuel and water plus excellent rail service made What Cheer a center for more than 50 manufacturing enterprises, producing everything from bicycles to wagons, clay products to wood stoves. (Ceramic pieces made by the late John Nelson are becoming collectors' items.) Other products include buttons, cigars, hobnail shoes and strawberry jam, the forerunner of corn-cob jelly. There was a brewery, but temperance drinks also were bottled in What Cheer, including "pop" so deliciously red it was hard to wash off children's faces.

The Midwest's largest clay pit was at What Cheer but the area was mainly agricultural. Early day milkmaids could hear miners' picks hacking away coal under the barns.

The town's first opera house burned in 1890. Three years later, the Masonic Lodge built a three-story brick structure with a theater seating 800, and a third floor hall. Nationally known repertoire companies often came to What Cheer a few weeks after they appeared on Broadway. Names on old playbills included Weber & Fields, the Cherry Sisters, and the Crowe Sisters, local girls who became famous.

STAGE WAS TOO SMALL FOR CHARIOT RACE

When John Phillip Sousa's band played, it overflowed the stage and out the rear entrance. The opera house managers tried to get "Ben Hur" but the advance man said the stage was too small for the chariot race.

The "Boston Belles" were turned away because, to quote an early editor, "The beauty and enticing qualities of these rare specimens of feminine extracts of Mother Eve might cause rare disappointments or broken hearts among our young men."

Miners often reserved seats in the balcony on a year-round basis and the clattering applause of their stomping hob-nailed boots literally made the rafters ring.

Graduation exercises were held in the opera house. One young girl graduate, now busy with restoration work, noticed that her mother cried all through the program. She learned later that a coal cinder caused the tears to flow. Carl Draegert, also on the committee, came to see his first movie, "The Birth of a Nation." He came on the train from Thornburg, five miles away.

THERE WAS SOMETHING ABOUT THE PLACE

The old opera house was slated for destruction when What Cheer prepared to observe its centennial as an incorporated town, in 1965. People thought it would be nice to keep the building intact until after the celebration, at least. A farmer named Lee Coulton headed a group of citizens who stopped the "headache ball" and prevented the opera house from being razed. A door-to-door can-

vass of the town resulted in enough money, and interest, to pay off the contractor who wanted the old bricks, and to start the cry "Save the Opera House."

The year of the opera was long past. The interior had been remodeled to house a movie theater which closed 15 years ago. But, as Fred Waring said, there was something about the place that wouldn't submit quietly to the wrecker's ball. Things like the beautifully curved "horseshoe" of the balcony; incredible acoustics, and memorabilia like the old reserved seat ticket board, and a "Quo Vadis" poster.

The What Cheer Opera House non-profit organization was formed and went to work. Countless hours of labor have been donated. "Big name" band leaders responded to personal appeals. Guy Lombardo was the first to come; he passed the word to others. They didn't believe a grass roots theater could be that good. One said he'd lose money coming to What Cheer, "... but that is the fun of being a millionaire." As for the audience, it clapped until its hands hurt. But there aren't any theater parties after the performances. "By then, we're all worn out."

The first time Guy Lombardo and his Royal Canadians appeared, there were no curtains for the stage, and the audience watched the band getting set up. Now, there are lush red velvet curtains and a gold-colored, fire-proof cyclorama. Spindles around the horseshoe curve of the balcony have been replaced and antiqued with some of the 70 gallons of gold and ivory paint used on the interior. An 85-year-old chandelier hangs from the ceiling and people dug into their attics and found old crystal shades for the light fixtures. (What Cheer's first electric light plant was built in 1890. It closed down at midnight, except on dance nights.)

The red brick exterior needs sand-blasting and some repointing, but the grand old lady is in surprisingly good shape. Stringers of ponderosa pine are 40 feet long, and as solid as the day they arrived from Oregon in 1893.

The future looks bright for the What Cheer Opera House. They're talking about getting Roger Williams and Tennessee Ernie Ford, maybe even Meredith Willson and Liberace.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the so-called open housing amendment.

I believe that when the American people are made aware of the full impact and effect of this vicious legislation that overwhelming opposition to it will be expressed to Members of Congress.

In my judgment, in order to make a proper appraisal of the desirability of a so-called open housing law, it is necessary to look at the "big picture."

A reading of the hearings conducted on S. 1358 by the Subcommittee on

Housing and Urban Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and a study of the remarks made during these debates by proponents of this legislation, clearly show that the enactment of this bill is merely the first necessary step in a far-ranging plan to rearrange housing patterns in this country by means of Federal Government coercion, or the familiar "carrot-stick" approach.

It is important to emphasize that the proponents of these schemes state that the enactment of a so-called open housing law is the first compelling and necessary step that must be taken before the other parts of their plan can be put into effect. Thus, if the open housing bill is killed, then the other portions of this "master plan" cannot be put into operation.

The stated overall purpose of this "master plan" is the dispersal of the ghetto.

It is acknowledged, however, by the supporters of this legislation that its enactment will barely begin to do the job, and that then other measures must be taken. For instance, the chief sponsor of this amendment, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], made this statement in introducing the amendment on February 6, 1968:

Outlawing discrimination in the sale or renting of housing will not free those trapped in ghetto squalor, but it is an absolutely essential first step which must be taken—and taken soon. (Page 2274.)

In discussing the employment problems of ghetto residents created by the fact that new industry and job opportunities in recent years have been primarily situated in suburban areas, Senator MONDALE made clear what the "next step" would be:

Unless they are going to be able to move in the suburban communities through the elimination of housing discrimination and the provision of low- and moderate-cost housing, they are going to be deprived of many jobs because they will be unable to live in the central city and work in the suburbs—simply because they cannot afford the high cost of transportation. (Pages 2276-2277.)

In the debates on February 7, the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] explicitly made this point:

Unless non-whites are able to move into suburban communities by the elimination of housing discrimination, and the provision of low- and moderate-cost housing in these areas, they are going to continue to be deprived of jobs, no matter how extensive our efforts to employ them. (Page 2530.)

So, we are put on notice that if we enact a so-called open housing law, the next step will be for the Government to remove low-income slum residents to the suburbs because, of course, those persons cannot afford to pay for the suburban housing which the pending legislation would "open up."

One of the principal witnesses who testified in support of S. 1358 before the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs was the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Secretary Weaver. In his testimony, made an even more sweeping statement as to the necessity

for moving the residents of the central core cities out into other areas:

Let us assume that we do have a program of trying to do something to wipe out our pockets of poverty, of which large numbers are now racial ghettos. If we are going to improve the quality and the standard of housing and the standard of living in these areas, the first problem we are going to run into is the problem of densities. And in order to restore these areas so they will no longer be ghettos but will be attractive places—because I might say in passing very often they are very valuable real estate—one of the things you are going to have to do is move some of the people in there out. And you certainly are not going to be able to take care of the natural increase of population that would occur if you are going to have any reasonable densities, not only from a point of view of housing but from a point of view of public facilities, schools and other services.

So that you cannot even talk about revitalizing the areas of non-white concentration now without envisioning an equal opportunity so that these people can move out into other places, as they will have to move if you are going to be successful in your attack on the ghetto. (Hearings, page 40)

The issue of whether this "second step" of relocation of low-income slum residents to suburban areas should be accomplished, poses an immediate question to suburban residents throughout the Nation: "Do you want a potential rioter as a neighbor?"

The posing of this question is not an unreasonable expression of irrational fear because we have been told by the experts that one of the reasons for the slum riots of the last three summers is that slum residents feel such frustration at being an island of poverty surrounded by the affluence of middle- and upper-class America that their rage explodes into violence.

If this is true, and the experts have told us that it is true, then what effect would it have upon a low-income slum dweller to place him in a low-income housing development located in the middle of middle-class or upper-class suburbia? Of course, tensions would immediately be created and violence would predictably follow.

I do not believe that the American people desire such a drastic alteration in living patterns. Many people have gone to the suburbs to escape riots and civil disorders and I do not think it would be fair for us to take a step which would lead to the thrusting of these undesirable conditions upon them.

If anyone doubts that the Government would be able to bring about this result through the use of its coercive economic powers, then I would refer him to a statement and proposal made by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] during the hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs. Senator PROXMIRE addressed this question to Secretary Weaver:

How about a "carrot stick" approach using the power that the Federal Government does have to really put the Federal Government behind a policy of dispersion so that it would be possible for the people who now live in the central areas of some of our cities, much more possible for them, to move into suburban areas where the jobs are?

As you know we have very powerful economic forces in dispersing our industry, and

to try and run counter to that and bring them back in is pretty tough to do. And you have addressed yourself to that very well.

On the other hand, there is an artificial attempt and a successful attempt on the part of suburbs to exclude minority groups and poor people, zoning ordinances of various kinds and various other restrictions.

And I'm interested in the possibility of this kind of a provision. I will just read one short quotation from it.

"No Federal program of grants or loans administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be made available to any jurisdiction within which an adequate amount of decent housing as determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is not available for low and moderate income persons by reason of restrictions in zoning ordinances or building codes or other factors within the reasonable control of the jurisdiction or the State within which the jurisdiction is located." (Hearings, Page 73.)

Secretary Weaver's response, in part, is very revealing:

First, as far as the objective is concerned, I would be delighted if I had such a tool as a part of our activities and administrative devices. (Hearings, Page 73)

This is very similar to the arbitrary exercise of power by the Office of Education and HEW to force school systems to adopt a racial quota system in the public schools by threatening to withhold Federal funds. Many of us are well aware of the coercive power which can be unfairly used. If you believe that this "master plan" for housing patterns and ways of living is evil and undesirable, then I respectfully submit that you should vote against the "first necessary step"—which is this so-called open housing bill.

Mr. President, I would like to address this portion of my remarks to one of the most serious legal and constitutional objections to the pending bill, H.R. 2516. I hope that these remarks might help to clarify the thinking of my fellow Senators.

That paramount legal and constitutional question is whether section 5 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution empowers Congress to enact laws punishing purely private interference with the rights of equal protection of the law, due process of the law, and other rights granted by section (1) of that amendment.

I believe that the inescapable answer to this question is "No." A number of my colleagues are of the same opinion, and during these debates have discussed this question with much scholarly research and force of logic. I have previously discussed this question during the debates on January 25. Among the other Senators who have discussed this issue with great learning and eloquence are my esteemed colleagues the senior Senator from North Carolina and the senior Senator from South Carolina. I do not understand how one can read their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during these debates and fail to be convinced of the soundness of their position.

I should like to supplement the comments I have previously made on this question, and perhaps clarify this issue.

The proponents of this legislation seem to be certain that section 5 of the 14th amendment does authorize Congress to



enact laws to punish purely private interference with rights granted by the other provisions of that amendment. Their position might be fairly stated as follows:

Until the Supreme Court rendered its decision in the case of *U.S. v. Guest*, 383 U.S. 745, on March 28, 1966, there was some doubt as to whether Section 5 of the 14th Amendment authorizes Congress to enact laws to punish purely private interference with rights granted by the other provisions of the 14th Amendment, but after the rendition of that decision there can be no doubt that Congress does possess that power.

This position of the proponents of the bill is implicitly based upon the following premises:

First. Prior to the decision in the *Guest* case, the Supreme Court had never definitely decided whether section 5 of the 14th amendment authorizes Congress to enact laws to punish purely private interference with 14th amendment rights;

Second. The Supreme Court held in its opinion in the *Guest* case that Congress had such power, and this holding resolved the doubts which had previously existed on this question.

In my judgment, it can be clearly demonstrated that both of these premises are without basis in law or fact.

As to the first premise relied on by the proponents of this legislation, without reviewing in detail the numerous cases cited in my speech on this subject on January 25, and the speech of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] on January 19, and the speech of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], of January 24, it is clear that the Supreme Court has, in fact, addressed itself to this specific question in a long line of cases, and has definitely decided that section 5 of the 14th amendment does not confer this power upon Congress.

Among the decisions of the Supreme Court in which acts of Congress enacted pursuant to section 5 of the 14th amendment attempting to punish purely private interference with 14th amendment rights were held to be unconstitutional are: *United States v. Harris*, 106 U.S. 629, *The Civil Rights Cases*, 109 U.S. 3.

The question involved in the case of *United States against Harris*, supra, was whether section 5519 of the Revised Statutes was constitutional.

That statute attempted to punish purely private interference with rights granted by the Constitution of the United States, including the right to equal protection of the laws. Section 5519 of the Revised Statutes provided as follows:

If two or more persons in any State or Territory conspire or go in disguise upon the highway or on the premises of another for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons of the equal protection of the laws or of equal privileges or immunities under the laws, or for the purpose of preventing or hindering the constituted authorities of any State or Territory from giving or securing to all persons within such State or Territory the equal protection of the laws, each of said persons shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or by imprisonment, with or without hard labor, not less than six months nor more than six years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The Court carefully examined the question of whether this legislation was

authorized by the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments of the Constitution. The Court held that none of these amendments authorized Congress to enact this legislation, and held that section 5519 was unconstitutional.

In discussing the precise question of whether section 5519 was authorized by the first and fifth sections of the 14th amendment, the Court held as follows:

It is, however, strenuously insisted that the legislation under consideration finds its warrant in the first and fifth sections of the Fourteenth Amendment. The first section declares "all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The fifth section declares "the Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this amendment."

It is perfectly clear from the language of the first section that its purpose also was to place a restraint upon the action of the States. In *Slaughter-House Cases*, 16 Wall. 36, it was held by the majority of the court, speaking by Mr. Justice Miller, that the object of the second clause of the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment was to protect from the hostile legislation of the States the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States; and this was conceded by Mr. Justice Field, who expressed the views of the dissenting justices in that case. In the same case the court, referring to the Fourteenth Amendment, said that "if the States do not conform their laws to its requirements, then by the fifth section of the article of amendment Congress was authorized to enforce it by suitable legislation."

The purpose and effect of the two sections of the Fourteenth Amendment above quoted were clearly defined by Mr. Justice Bradley in the case of *United States v. Cruikshank*, 1 Woods 308, as follows: "It is a guaranty of protection against the acts of the State government itself. It is a guaranty against the exertion of arbitrary and tyrannical power on the part of the government and legislature of the State, not a guaranty against the commission of individual offenses; and the power of Congress, whether express or implied, to legislate for the enforcement of such a guaranty does not extend to the passage of laws for the suppression of crime within the States. The enforcement of the guaranty does not require or authorize Congress to perform 'the duty that the guaranty itself supposes it to be the duty of the State to perform, and which it requires the States to perform.'"

When the cases of *United States v. Cruikshank* came to this court, the same view was taken here. The Chief Justice, delivering the opinion of the court in that case, said: "The Fourteenth Amendment prohibits a State from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or from denying to any person the equal protection of the laws; but this provision does not add anything to the rights of one citizen as against another. It simply furnishes an additional guarantee against any encroachment by the States upon the fundamental rights which belong to every citizen as a member of society. The duty of protecting all its citizens in the enjoyment of an equality of rights was originally assumed by the States, and it remains there. The only obligation resting upon the United States is to see that the States do not deny the right. This the amendment

guarantees, and no more. The power of the national government is limited to this guaranty." (92 U.S. 542).

So in *Virginia v. Rives*, 100 id. 313, it was declared by this court, speaking by Mr. Justice Strong, that "these provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment have reference to State action exclusively, and not to any action of private individuals."

These authorities show conclusively that the legislation under consideration finds no warrant for its enactment in the Fourteenth Amendment.

The language of the amendment does not leave this subject in doubt. When the State has been guilty of no violation of its provisions; when it has not made or enforced any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; when no one of its departments has deprived any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or denied to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws; when, on the contrary, the laws of the State, as enacted by its legislative, and construed by its judicial, and administered by its executive departments recognize and protect the rights of all persons, the amendment imposes no duty and confers no power upon Congress.

Section 5519 of the Revised Statutes is not limited to take effect only in case the State shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, or deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny to any person the equal protection of the laws. It applies no matter how well the State may have performed its duty. Under it private persons are liable to punishment for conspiring to deprive any one of the equal protection of the laws enacted by the State.

In the indictment in this case, for instance, which would be a good indictment under the law if the law itself were valid, there is no intimation that the State of Tennessee has passed any law or done any act forbidden by the Fourteenth Amendment. On the contrary, the gravamen of the charge against the accused is that they conspired to deprive certain citizens of the United States and of the State of Tennessee of the equal protection accorded them by the laws of Tennessee.

As, therefore, the section of the law under consideration is directed exclusively against the action of private persons, without reference to the laws of the State or their administration by her officers, we are clear in the opinion that it is not warranted by any clause in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution (106 U.S., pgs. 637-640.)

This clear holding of the Supreme Court in the *Harris* case should demonstrate the fallacy of the argument made by the proponents of this measure that although the Supreme Court has ruled that section 1 of the 14th amendment can only apply to State action, and not acts of individuals, that Court has never held that section 5 of the 14th amendment could not authorize Congress to enact legislation punishing purely private interference with 14th amendment rights.

If the holding of the Supreme Court in the *Harris* case is not persuasive authority to proponents of H.R. 2516, then perhaps the holding of the Supreme Court in the *Civil Rights Cases*, 109 U.S. 3, will convince even the most skeptical.

The precise question determined by the Supreme Court in that case was the constitutionality of sections 1 and 2 of the Civil Rights Act of 1875. Section 1 provided in essence that all persons within the United States shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of inns, public conveyances on land or water,

theaters, and other places of public amusement. Section 2 provided in substance that any person who shall violate section 1 by denying to any citizen the full enjoyment of any of the facilities or privileges of said establishments shall be liable civilly to the aggrieved party and shall be criminally punishable by a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not less than 30 days nor more than 1 year.

In holding that section 5 of the 14th amendment does not authorize Congress to punish purely private interference with 14th amendment rights, the Court said:

The first section of the Fourteenth Amendment (which is the one relied on), after declaring who shall be citizens of the United States, and of the several States, is prohibitory in character, and prohibitory upon the States. It declares that:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

"It is State action of a particular character that is prohibited. Individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject-matter of the amendment. It has a deeper and broader scope. It nullifies and makes void all State legislation, and State action of every kind, which impairs the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, or which injures them in life, liberty or property without due process of law, or which denies to any of them the equal protection of the laws. It not only does this, but, in order that the national will, thus declared, may not be a mere brutum fulmen, the last section of the amendment invests Congress with power to enforce it by appropriate legislation. To enforce what? To enforce the prohibition. To adopt appropriate legislation for correcting the effects of such prohibited State laws and State acts, and thus to render them effectually null, void, and innocuous. This is the legislative power conferred upon Congress, and this is the whole of it. It does not invest Congress with power to legislate upon subjects which are within the domain of State legislation; but to provide modes of relief against State legislation, or State action, of the kind referred to. It does not authorize Congress to create a code of municipal law for the regulation of private rights; but to provide modes of redress against the operation of State laws, and the action of State officers executive or judicial, when these are subversive of the fundamental rights specified in the amendment. (109 U.S. pgs. 10-11).

And so in the present case, until some State law has been passed, or some State action through its officers or agents has been taken, adverse to the rights of citizens sought to be protected by the Fourteenth Amendment, no legislation of the United States under said amendment, nor any proceeding under such legislation, can be called into ac-

tivity: for the prohibitions of the amendment are against State laws and acts done under State authority. (109 U.S. pg. 13).

In fine, the legislation which Congress is authorized to adopt in this behalf is not general legislation upon the rights of the citizen, but corrective legislation, that is, such as may be necessary and proper for counteracting such laws as the States may adopt or enforce, and which, by the amendment, they are prohibited from making or enforcing, or such acts and proceedings as the States may commit or take, and which, by the amendment, they are prohibited from committing or taking. It is not necessary for us to state, if we could, what legislation would be proper for Congress to adopt. It is sufficient for us to examine whether the law in question is of that character.

An inspection of the law shows that it makes no reference whatever to any supposed or apprehended violation of the Fourteenth Amendment on the part of the States. It is not predicated on any such view. It proceeds *ex directo* to declare that certain acts committed by individuals shall be deemed offences, and shall be prosecuted and punished by proceedings in the courts of the United States. It does not profess to be corrective of any constitutional wrong committed by the States; it does not make its operation to depend upon any such wrong committed. It applies equally to cases arising in States which have the justest laws respecting the personal rights of citizens and whose authorities are ever ready to enforce such laws, as to those which arise in States that may have violated the prohibition of the amendment. In other words, it steps into the domain of local jurisprudence, and lays down rules for the conduct of individuals in society towards each other, and imposes sanctions for the enforcement of those rules, without referring in any manner to any supposed action of the State or its authorities.

If this legislation is appropriate for enforcing the prohibitions of the amendment, it is difficult to see where it is to stop. Why may not Congress with equal show of authority enact a code of laws for the enforcement and vindication of all rights of life, liberty, and property? If it is supposable that the States may deprive persons of life, liberty, and property without due process of law (and the amendment itself does suppose this), why should not Congress proceed at once to prescribe due process of law for the protection of every one of these fundamental rights, in every possible case, as well as to prescribe equal privileges in inns, public conveyances and theaters? The truth is, that the implication of a power to legislate in this manner is based upon the assumption that if the States are forbidden to legislate or act in a particular way on a particular subject, and power is conferred upon Congress to enforce the prohibition, this gives Congress power to legislate generally upon that subject, and not merely the power to provide modes of redress against such State legislation or action. The assumption is certainly unsound. (109 U.S., pgs. 13-15).

If the principles of interpretation which we have laid down are correct, as we deem

them to be (and they are in accord with the principles laid down in the cases before referred to as well as in the recent case of *United States v. Harris*, 106 U.S. 629), it is clear that the law in question cannot be sustained by any grant of legislative power made to Congress by the Fourteenth Amendment. That amendment prohibits the States from denying to any person the equal protection of the laws, and declares that Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of the amendment. The law in question, without any reference to adverse State legislation on the subject, declares that all persons shall be entitled to equal accommodations and privileges of inns, public conveyances, and places of public amusement, and imposes a penalty upon any individual who shall deny to any citizen such equal accommodations and privileges. This is not corrective legislation; it is primary and direct; it takes immediate and absolute possession of the subject of the right of admission to inns, public conveyances, and places of amusement. It supersedes and displaces State legislation on the same subject, or only allows it permissive force. It ignores such legislation, and assumes that the matter is one that belongs to the domain of national regulation. Whether it would not have been a more effective protection of the rights of citizens to have clothed Congress with plenary power over the whole subject, is not now the question. What we have to decide is, whether such plenary power has been conferred upon Congress by the Fourteenth Amendment; and in our judgment, it has not. (109 U.S., pgs. 18-19).

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 28, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 27, 1968:

##### U.S. MARSHAL

James E. Atwood, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Daniel T. Donovan, resigned.

Nomination from the District of Columbia received by the Senate February 27, 1968:

##### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Alfred P. Love for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 3, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 27, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
Rev. Uno A. Plank, St. Mark's Estonian Lutheran Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, as we start this session today, we commemorate the independence of a once free Estonia.

We pray for the freedom of its people

and all captive nations ruled by Communists.

Thou hast said: "There is a time wherein one man ruleth over another to his hurt."

This Thy truth gives us hope for a free Estonia. Hope springs eternal.

Lord, bless this country. The captive

nations look upon it as a fortress of freedom. Let it stand firm against slavery and tyranny.

Grant Thy blessing and wisdom to the President and to those who are responsible for finding ways of peace and freedom.

Bless this House and command the Evil